

THE SAMUEL TRADITIONS:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE ANTI-MONARCHICAL SOURCE
IN I SAMUEL 1-15

A dissertation presented

by

Austin David Ritterspach

to

The Faculty of the Graduate Theological Union
and the San Francisco Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Berkeley, California
May 8, 1967

Copyright by Austin David Ritterspach
All rights reserved.

To Norma

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABBREVIATIONS	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. A REVIEW OF SOURCE ANALYSIS OF I SAM. 1-15	7
III. AN ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT	54
IV. THE ANTI-MONARCHICAL SOURCE	120
Extent of the Source	120
Themes in the Elohist and Deuteronomy	152
Importance of Exodus and Conquest Traditions	153
Significance of the Prophet; his Role in Israel	163
Emphasis Upon Moses	168
Use of Covenant <u>Gattung</u> . Parallels Between the Covenant Code and Deut. 12-26	170
Yahweh Alone Shall Rule	174
Religious Orientation	178
Basic Themes in the Anti-Monarchical Source ...	184
Exodus and Conquest Traditions	185
Significance of the Prophet; his Role in Israel	187
Use of Covenant <u>Gattung</u> . Parallels in the Law	188
Yahweh Alone Shall Rule	193
Religious Orientation	196
Key Words and Phrases	199
Conclusions	211
V. THE FIGURE OF SAMUEL IN THE ANTI-MONARCHICAL SOURCE	224
Literary Affinities	226

Chapter

Page

V

Form-Critical Parallels	233
Similar Functions of Moses and Samuel	263
The Historical Samuel	281
Origin of the Anti-Monarchical Source	302
Conclusion	311
BIBLIOGRAPHY	315

ABBREVIATIONS

AJSL, The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.

BA, The Biblical Archaeologist.

BASOR, Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.

BJRL, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.

BR, Biblical Research.

CBQ, Catholic Biblical Quarterly.

HTR, The Harvard Theological Review.

HUCA, Hebrew Union College Annual.

JBL, Journal of Biblical Literature.

JNES, Journal of Near Eastern Studies.

JQR, Jewish Quarterly Review.

TZ, Theologische Zeitschrift.

VT, Vetus Testamentum.

ZAW, Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

ZKWL, Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft und Kirchliche Leben.

ZTK, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

While I assume full responsibility for the material as set forth in the dissertation, I would like to acknowledge those who have assisted me in my work on the topic. Perhaps it is not out of order to begin with the Graduate Theological Union itself. A dissertation is a special genre of literature and one of its distinctive features is that it is the result of the student's study in his graduate program. It is my hope that this dissertation reflects to some degree the high quality of scholarship and the interest in significant issues in theological studies that are already associated with the school.

The credit for many of the improvements in the argument of these pages must go to my dissertation committee, consisting of Professors Norman K. Gottwald of the Graduate Theological Union, Jonas Greenfield of the University of California, and James Muilenburg of the Graduate Theological Union. I want to express my deep appreciation for their able criticisms and helpful suggestions. In addition, Professor David N. Freedman of the Graduate Theological Union examined with me numerous problems of textual criticism discussed in Chapter III. I owe a special indebtedness to Professor Muilenburg, who is chairman of my committee. He has devoted untold hours in reading the

Biblical text with me; in discussion of the essential elements of my argument; and in careful reading of the manuscript. His knowledge of scholarship in the field and his careful attention to matters of literary style have improved not only the content but the statement of the dissertation immeasurably. My initial interest in the Samuel traditions dates to his course on the Mediator of the Covenant, Winter, 1965. Finally I want to acknowledge the contribution of my wife which goes far beyond her proof-reading of the manuscript. Her patience, support, and confidence have never failed through the long ordeal that is graduate school.

Berkeley, California

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Recent Biblical scholarship has called attention to the importance of the period immediately preceding the reign of Saul for the formation of Israel's religious traditions. In his pioneering work on the life of Israel in the pre-monarchical period, Martin Noth¹ demonstrated that the organization of the tribes constituted a confederacy based on worship at a common shrine and allegiance to Yahweh. Analysis of Jos. 24 in particular indicates the extent to which certain traditions of salvation history were central to Israel's cultic life: deliverance from Egypt; conquest of the Promised Land; covenant relation with Yahweh; and the role of the charismatic leader who proclaimed the word of God and led Israel in holy war.² Gerhard von Rad views the credal statements in Deut. 6:20-24 and 26:5-9 as the framework for the formulation of the entire Hexateuch.³

¹Martin Noth, Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels (Darmstadt, 1966; reprint of German edition, 1930).

²Ibid., pp. 133-40. Klaus Baltzer, Das Bundesformular (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, IV; Neukirchen, 1960), pp. 29-37. James Muilenburg, "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations," VT IX (1959), 357-60.

³Gerhard von Rad, "The Problem of the Hexateuch," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, tr. Trueman Dicken (Edinburgh and London, 1966; tr. of Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, Munich, 1958), pp. 2-8.

Emphasis upon the primacy of such traditions as exodus and conquest has been accompanied by identification of the treaty Gattung in the Elohist account of the covenant at Sinai (Ex. 20-24)⁴ and in the present structure of Deuteronomy.⁵ Dennis McCarthy has demonstrated that one cannot argue from parallels in Hittite treaties that the covenant Gattung is Mosaic,⁶ nevertheless it is not unreasonable to assume that the treaty structure was influential upon "Israel's" oral traditions by the time of Joshua.

The two sources of the Hexateuch which reflect the major elements of "amphictyonic" theology as well as the covenant Gattung are Deuteronomy and the Elohist (see below, Chapter IV). Therefore the dating of these materials has undergone considerable revision in recent scholarship. It is not unreasonable to suggest that E antedates J⁷ or even that it is a product of prophetic circles in the early monarchical period.⁸ In a similar way, the traditions underlying Deuteronomy appear to derive from an early period when the ideal of

⁴Baltzer, op. cit., pp. 37-40. George E. Mendenhall, Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East (Pittsburgh, 1955), pp. 35-41. For a qualified view, cf. Dennis McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant (Rome, 1963), pp. 152-63.

⁵von Rad, "Problem," pp. 26-33.

⁶McCarthy, op. cit., p. 174.

⁷Martin Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch (Stuttgart, 1948), pp. 248-49.

⁸Artur Weiser, The Old Testament. Its Formation and Development, tr. Dorothea M. Barton (New York, 1961; tr. of Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Göttingen, 1948), pp. 124-25. Alan W. Jenks, The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions (Cambridge, Mass., 1965; microfilm), pp. 262-66.

exclusive loyalty to Yahweh was embodied in holy war ideology, in the role of the charismatic leader sent by Yahweh (Deut. 18:18), and in covenant motifs.⁹

Thus, the period before the monarchy--extending back to the time of earliest Israelite settlement in Canaan but also including the time of Samuel--suggests itself as the time when Israel's most significant traditions were emerging as the substance of her cultic life. Certain questions result from this conclusion. What was the relation of Samuel to those circles concerned with the formulation and "re-presentation" of these north Israelite traditions? Did Samuel hold an official position in the cult, or in the political life of the confederation, comparable to Moses' role? Was Samuel a leader of "all Israel" or simply a local figure with limited functions and power? Assuming that the situation during the time of tribal confederacy was one of religious orthodoxy, what effect did the introduction of a monarchy have?

A consideration of these issues involves one most directly with the so-called "anti-monarchical" traditions in I Sam. 1-15, and it is to these passages that I confine my study.¹⁰ To isolate and characterize certain passages in these opening chapters of I Samuel acknowledges a difference

⁹Gerhard von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, tr. David Stalker (Studies in Biblical Theology; London, 1953; tr. of Deuteronomium Studien, rev. ed., 1948), pp. 45-59.

¹⁰I Sam. 7:3-17; 8:1-22; 10:17-27; 12:1-25; 15:1-35, with the addition of the birth and call narrative in 1:1-3:21. See below, Chapter IV, for a discussion of the precise extent of the anti-monarchical source.

in perspective and concerns from the material which remains. In 7:15ff,¹¹ Samuel is described as a judge over the entire nation with a circuit that included Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah. In the account of Saul's search for the asses, however, Samuel appears as a relatively unknown diviner. Although the Philistines clearly continue to be a threat (cf. 10:5; 13:3), nevertheless it is claimed in 7:13-14 that Samuel vanquished them completely. Most significant of all are the impressions we receive of Samuel's attitude toward the monarchy. On the one hand, Samuel clearly opposes kingship (8:6, 10ff; 10:17), which he equates with a rejection of Yahweh. In chap. 12, Samuel's exhortation of covenantal obedience to Yahweh alone prompts the people to admit their sin in demanding a king: "And all the people said to Samuel, 'Pray for your servants to Yahweh your God, that we may not die; for we have added to all our sins this evil, to ask for ourselves a king.'" (12:19). On the other hand, Samuel is portrayed as sympathetic to the institution of the monarchy. In 9:22-10:1, Samuel receives the king-designate as a guest of honor and subsequently anoints him. In 11:12-15 Samuel acknowledges that Saul has delivered Israel from her enemies, and he leads the people to Gilgal for a renewal of the monarchy. Even in Samuel's rebuke of Saul at Gilgal (13:7b-15), the prophet does not question the desirability of kingship. A successor for Saul is clearly anticipated: "But now

¹¹All references to passages in I Samuel which involve citation of chapter and verse are given without the book title.

your kingdom shall not continue; Yahweh has sought out a man after his own heart. Yahweh has appointed him to be a nagid over his people, because you have not kept what Yahweh commanded you."

In view of the trends of recent scholarship and the existence of notable differences in the various accounts of the age of Samuel, the purpose of the dissertation is twofold: a determination of the precise extent and provenance of the anti-monarchical source and an analysis of Samuel's role in Israel's religious and political communities according to this source. Chapter II consists of a discussion of the history of scholarship on the question of sources in I Sam. 1-15. The review forms the basis for my own argument for an anti-monarchical source and underscores the inclination in scholarship of recent decades to assign greater historical value to the anti-monarchical traditions. In Chapter III, I have dealt with textual problems in the passages which encompass the anti-monarchical source.¹² The determination of the text is based upon various manuscripts of LXX, as well as available information concerning the Qumran Samuel scroll. Chapter IV sets forth the argument for the precise extent of the anti-monarchical source and undertakes a comparison of this material with the Elohist and Deuteronomy, on the basis of themes and terminology. This provides a basis for conclusions on the date and provenance of the anti-monarchical source. In Chapter V, the

¹²See above, p. 3.

portrayal of Samuel in this source is analysed. Evidence is introduced for the claim that Samuel is viewed as a Mosaic figure and mediator of Israel's sacred traditions. Finally the issue of Samuel's historical role is discussed. This goes beyond the limits of the anti-monarchical source per se and relates directly to the major event of the age of Samuel: the establishment of the monarchy.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF SOURCE ANALYSIS OF I SAM. 1-15

The issue which is basic to a discussion of the Samuel-Saul narratives in I Sam. 1-15 is the question of sources. A decision as to the presence of one source with Deuteronomic additions, two or more parallel sources, or numerous independent sanctuary traditions has repeatedly influenced scholars' views of the rise of kingship and the figure of Samuel. For this reason, I shall review the history of scholarship from Karl Graf and Julius Wellhausen to the present with regard to this question. Such a discussion will provide the context for my own identification of an anti-monarchical source (cf. Chapter IV). No attempt has been made to summarize the view of every scholar who has written on the subject. I have undertaken, rather, to select those scholars whose contributions may be said to be representative of a position or who mark new departures in the history of the subject. Generally speaking, the review proceeds chronologically, but it seems appropriate to discuss first of all the work of three recent scholars since they stand apart from the main body of critical scholarship in maintaining that the Biblical account as it stands reflects a single source and is basically self-consistent.

In his article on "Die Erzählung von Sauls Königswahl," Martin Buber¹ attempts to demonstrate the essential unity of the narrative over against the claims of those who support a two source theory or fragment hypothesis.² Buber recognizes the value of the theory that the author used traditions of opposing viewpoints. These were not so much "pro-monarchical" and "anti-monarchical," however, as they were pro- and anti-Saul. The anti-Saul tradition, which in effect is pro-David, appears most clearly in 13:14, where Samuel predicts David's rule.

I Sam. 7 is an introduction to the author's account of the establishment of a monarchy. A basic theme of the people's cry (7:8) and Yahweh's response (7:10) is set forth. The claim that Samuel defeated the Philistines is not a mere Deuteronomic exaggeration but rather an interpretation of Yahweh's actions for his people, based upon the author's knowledge that the Philistines were vanquished under Saul and David. The account unfolds in a logical manner. Following the people's demand for a king (8:1-22), Yahweh's choice is made known and the designated one is invested with appropriate worth (9:1-27).³ Buber argues that the author of 7:3-16 also wrote 9:1-27. He bases his view on the repetition of numerous key words and phrases. The motif of the people's cry to

¹Martin Buber, "Die Erzählung von Sauls Königswahl," VT VI (1965), pp. 113-73.

²Ibid., pp. 113-16.

³Ibid., pp. 119-21.

Yahweh (bā'āh) occurs in both pericopes (7:8 and 9:16), although the verb z'q is used in the former. In both passages the affliction of the people at the hands of the Philistines is the central reason for Yahweh's actions.⁴

Buber seeks to resolve the question of whether Saul was a nāgīd (9:16) or a melek (10:24, 25). He views the designation nāgīd as an indication that Saul is to be a deputy, commissioned for a particular task by Yahweh. This is a modification of the people's demand. It marks the conversion of a primitive, direct theocracy to an indirect one. The idea of a king, however, is the more popular interpretation of Saul's role.⁵ With this in mind, the content of 12:1-25 is quite in keeping with the author's concerns. It is not a late Deuteronomic construction. Buber identifies two speeches here, vv. 1-4 and vv. 13-15, 24. In the second speech, Samuel insists on the type of modified theocracy which Yahweh has instituted. Samuel is sympathetic to the king, but he does not fail to remind Saul and the people of the ultimate sovereignty of Yahweh. The meaning of the command for obedience to Yahweh in vv. 14-15 lies in Samuel's contention that the power of the state is subject to prophetic criticism.⁶

I. Sam. 11 is frequently viewed as a very early account which is not in keeping with the passages before and after it,

⁴Ibid., p. 127.

⁵Ibid., pp. 127-41.

⁶Ibid., p. 162.

chiefly because Samuel plays such a minor role in the events. Buber argues that the sequence of chapters is quite logical and illustrates a natural continuity, however. After the demands of the people, the choice of king is made and the laws of kingship are proclaimed (10:17-27). Then comes the human demonstration of the wisdom of the divine choice. Saul proves himself capable in the battle at Jabesh Gilead (11:1-11).⁷ The reference to Samuel in v. 7 is not a gloss. The author is concerned at all times to associate the anointed with the one who anoints. Samuel is mentioned again in v. 15.⁸ The events in 11:12-15 are a renewal of the kingship after Saul's abilities have been demonstrated. The people's demand for death to Saul's detractors is not a late addition. Rather, it parallels the demand for Jonathan's death, 14:44ff.⁹

In Buber's analysis only one major passage comprises a later addition to the narrative: the list of evil practices of kings in 8:11-18; 8:7b and 12:12b also are the work of this editor whose concerns are explicitly anti-monarchical after the excesses of Solomon's reign (cf. Deut. 17:15-17 from the same hand).¹⁰

Another scholar who views the Samuel-Saul narrative as a

⁷Ibid., p. 153.

⁸Buber follows LXX in this verse: "Samuel made Saul king there before Yahweh at Gilgal. They offered peace offerings there before Yahweh, and Samuel and all the men of Israel rejoiced there exceedingly."

⁹Ibid., pp. 151-53, 156.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 171.

whole is Edward Robertson. In his article on "Samuel and Saul," Robertson acknowledges the presence of many traditions and literary fragments behind the present narrative. They have been ordered into a self-consistent narrative by a compiler, however.¹¹ Robertson contends that the work of literary critics upon the accounts of Samuel and Saul has produced a bewildering, and largely useless, array of theories. Even if individual traditions or "sources" could be isolated and identified, this would accomplish little. What we must determine is the purpose of the compiler and the methods he employed in presenting us with an account that has two main themes: Samuel's role in Israel's life and the birth of the monarchy.¹² The references to Saul as nāgīd and as melek do not indicate two different sources, in Robertson's view. To be sure, at the secret meal at Ramah (9:1-27), Samuel anoints Saul as a nāgīd. The term means a military commander, and Saul's role is much the same as that of Barak to Deborah. While Saul awaits his opportunity to wage war against Israel's enemies, the people renew their demand for a king like other nations. Samuel naturally anoints as melek the man whom Yahweh had chosen as nāgīd.¹³ Throughout I Sam. 1-15, Samuel's role as an important leader in Israel is maintained. Robertson finds no exception to this in 9:1-10:16, where most scholars

¹¹Edward Robertson, "Samuel and Saul," BJRL XXVIII (1944), 175-206.

¹²Ibid., pp. 177-80.

¹³Ibid., pp. 183-86.

have maintained that Samuel is merely a local seer. Yahweh alone is responsible that the two men meet. For this reason, neither Samuel nor Saul knows that the other is near at hand. Once they have met, however, Saul is quite aware of the importance of the event. The purpose of Saul's conversation with his uncle (10:14-16) is to underscore this awareness.¹⁴

Robertson's thesis is that a compiler grouped his material into six sections or frames, each of which is concluded (or in some cases introduced) by "supplementa" from the compiler's own hand. Section I (1:1-3:21, minus 2:1-10) has as its theme the downfall of the house of Eli and the presaging of Samuel's greatness. The verses that follow (3:19-21) form the supplementa, which are the logical conclusion of this account. The subject of Section II (4:1b-7:2) is the fate of the ark. The supplementa consist simply of the last verse of the section. Section III (7:3-17) is of special importance because here we have the picture of Samuel as the highly successful military leader. There is no reason to question the theocratic type of government in view of Samuel's successes. According to the supplementa (vv. 13-17), Samuel subdues the Philistines and performs his tasks as judge and priest.¹⁵

Section IV deals with the matter of choosing a king. It is divided by Robertson into two subsections: 8:1-10:27 (supplementa, 10:25-27) and 11:1-15 (supplementa, vv. 14-15). The

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 182-83.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 189-91.

introductory paragraph in 8:1-6 anticipates events that followed much later. Nevertheless, it indicates that the need for a king arises with the prospect that Samuel will soon have to relinquish the mantle of leadership. Samuel's displeasure, Yahweh's choice of Saul, and Saul's secret anointing at Gilgal follow in logical order. The election of Saul by lot (10:17-27) may have actually followed the battle recorded in 11:1-11. The abdication speech of 12:1-25 forms a conclusion to the whole section. Although harsh in its judgment of the people and the king, the speech is in keeping with Samuel's role heretofore. It indicates Samuel's intent to maintain his position as prophet and priest: "As for me, far be it from me that I should sin before Yahweh by ceasing to pray for you" (12:23). The purpose of Section V (13:1-14:52; supplementa, 14:47-52) is to record Saul's ascendancy to leadership in Israel. His attempt to offer sacrifice (13:8ff) in Samuel's absence illustrates the role which he claims for himself. Saul, however, fails to make good his claim, and Samuel is quick to re-assert his position over the monarch.¹⁶ Section VI (15:1-35) is the concluding frame in the narrative and the introduction to the narrative of David. The account makes terribly clear the irrevocable break between Samuel and Saul. The supplementa consist of vv. 34-35, where we are told that Samuel never came to Saul again.

For Robertson, the central purpose of the compiler is to

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 192-97.

portray a fundamental conflict between civil and religious authority in Israel. He argues that this internal crisis developed as Israel settled in Canaan. Threatened for the first time by external forces, Israel felt the need for a warrior-leader, rather than a priest-leader. As often happens, this controversy was reflected in a struggle between two major personalities. Samuel sought to defend and promote the rights of religious authority over the secular sphere, which was embodied in the king-designate, Saul.¹⁷ In this analysis, Samuel is viewed as much more than a priest, the successor of Eli. He is also prophet and judge over all Israel. In short all of the traditions concerning Samuel are accepted as valid.

W. F. Albright analyzes the traditions concerning Samuel in his essay on "Samuel and the beginnings of prophecy." Samuel successfully diminished the role of the priests and Levites as well as the dominance of the cult of Shiloh. In this way he initiated the prophetic movement.¹⁸ Albright notes a number of apparent discrepancies in the portrayal of Samuel. He is both an Ephraimite layman (1:1) and a Levite (I Chr. 6:16-43). While Samuel is portrayed as judge over all Israel (7:15ff), he is also presented as a local diviner (9:6ff). The claim that Samuel completely vanquished

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 197-201.

¹⁸W. F. Albright, Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement (Cincinnati, 1961), p. 18.

the Philistines (7:13-15) is at odds with the accounts of numerous subsequent battles (10:5; 13:3). Finally, Samuel both opposes the monarchy (8:6ff) and supports it (9:17ff).¹⁹ Albright seeks to resolve these discrepancies. The variance of opinion with regard to Samuel's family tree and the question of his fame stems from reports that reflect different periods of his life. The false claim in chap. 7 that Samuel vanquished the Philistines is an exaggeration derived from a situation of truce between the two peoples. The use of the term nagid in chap. 9 is a precise designation (with parallels from the Sefireh treaties) for the position of "military commander." while Samuel had ordained Saul for such a role, he was opposed to any position as authoritative as kingship would be.²⁰

The foregoing review has indicated that Buber, Robertson, and Albright hold in common the basic theory that one consistent account is present in I Sam. 1-15. In this way they are at variance to most Biblical scholars. A recognition of differences in style and perspective has influenced scholarship on the Samuel-Saul narratives from the time of Karl Graf to the present. In his commentary on the historical books, Graf identifies major periods in Israel's history, each of which is concluded by a summary chapter. In this analysis I Sam. 12 concludes the period of the judges, just as Jos. 24

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 10-11.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 15-16.

closed the period of the Conquest. The editorial hand which combined individual accounts in Jud. 2-16 is also responsible for late, non-historical portions of the account of Samuel and Saul, i.e., 7:3-8, 22; 10:17-12:25. The demand that foreign gods be put away in Jos. 24:23 is paralleled in 7:3, 4. The motif of Israel's suffering and her cry to Yahweh is present in 7:8 as it is in Jud. 2:16, 18; 3:9; 6:6, 14. The basic source upon which the books of Samuel are based is a history of Saul and David. The account in 9:1-10:16 of Samuel and Saul's meeting and Samuel's secret ordaining of Saul, belongs to this account, which is Elohist. It is very close to the events narrated and is an extension of the E source in the Hexateuch.²¹

Julius Wellhausen identified two versions of the account of Saul's accession. One is pro-monarchical and consists of 9:1-10:16 and 11:1-15. This account is continued in the narrative of the battles with the Philistines in 13:1-14:52. The other version is late and anti-monarchical. It consists of 7:3-17; 8:1-22; 10:17-27; 12:1-25. The negative view of kingship as a rejection of Yahweh predominates in this version. The same perspective is found in the editorial passages of the Books of Kings and in Deuteronomy. Wellhausen considers the mspt hmlkh in 10:25 as the royal laws of Deut. 17:14-20.²²

²¹Karl Heinrich Graf, Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments (Leipzig, 1866), pp. 97-98.

²²Julius Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments. Fourth Edition (Berlin, 1963), pp. 240-44.

The events which are narrated in the source are subsumed in a rigid, pietistic scheme, which bears the familiar pattern of "rebellion, affliction, conversion, peace. . . ." The author reviews broad periods of history with brief strokes that presume the acquaintance of his hearers with the details (cf. 7:13-14, end of Philistine domination, and 12:6-12, review of the period of the judges).²³ The anti-monarchical source contradicts the pro-monarchical account, upon which it depends. Wellhausen is very explicit about the question of historicity in this anti-monarchical source: "There cannot be a word of truth in the whole narrative."²⁴

Therefore Wellhausen gives no credence to the attitude toward kingship and the position of Samuel in the anti-monarchical source. In these chapters, the monarchy is a departure from the divine economy. It is an apostate act to desire a king, such as the other nations have. By implication a theocracy is the only form of government that conforms to the Mosaic ideal and Mosaic age. Such a government never existed for Israel until after the exile, however; this fact therefore dates these particular accounts. During the time of Samuel and Saul there was no hostility toward the monarchy; the Israelites were fully conscious of the fact that the monarchy had delivered them from anarchy and destruction at

²³ Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (Cleveland, Ohio, 1957; tr. of Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels, 2nd edition, Berlin, 1883), pp. 247-48.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 249.

the hand of enemies.²⁵

That Hebrew antiquity knew nothing of any hostility or incompatibility between the heavenly and the earthly ruler is plain from the title Anointed of Jehovah, and from the hope of the prophets, whose ideal future would be incomplete without a human king.²⁶

Another scholar of the late nineteenth century inaugurated a new approach to the Samuel-Saul narratives by arguing for two parallel sources which are independent of each other.²⁷ Budde emphasizes the contradictions within the narrative over the need for a monarchy and Samuel's role in Israel. In 1:1-8:22; 10:17-24; 12:1-25; 15:1-35 Samuel is the chosen one of God. Under his leadership, Israel defeats the Philistines. A theocratic and religious view of events predominates, in which the people's demand for a king is a sinful deed. Although a king is chosen, he remains subject to the prophet.²⁸ Budde sees this source, which he calls M (Mizpah), as opposed to kingship. He criticizes Carl Cornill for deleting those passages in chaps. 8 and 10 that speak of the monarchy as a rejection of Yahweh.²⁹ The G source (Gilgal) is a history of Saul: 9:1-10:7, 9-16; 11:1-11, 15; 13:1-7a, 15b-18; 14:1-46, 52. It is an independent account, which portrays Samuel as a local seer whom

²⁵Ibid., pp. 254-57.

²⁶Ibid., p. 254.

²⁷Karl Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, Ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau (Giessen, 1890). Cf. also his commentary, Samuel (Kurzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament, III; Tübingen, 1902) and "Sauls Königswahl und Verwerfung," ZAW VIII (1888), 227-48.

²⁸Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, pp. 208-10.

²⁹Ibid., pp. 177-78.

God calls on special occasions. The monarchy is Yahweh's response to the cry of Israel for deliverance. After Saul is anointed, Samuel steps aside. In keeping with its emphasis on Saul, the Gilgal source includes lengthy accounts of his battles with the Philistines (13:1-14:46).³⁰

Budde identifies his M source with the Elohist of the Hexateuch, although he acknowledges the hand of the Deuteronomic editor in the prophecy of the Zadokite priesthood (2:27-36), the chronological note in 7:2, and the list of Saul's battles in 14:47-52.³¹ To prove his contention, Budde identifies Elohist themes and terminology in M. These include the emphasis on intercession; the motif of confession followed by plea for deliverance (cf. Num. 21; Jud. 10); the verb "present yourselves" or "stand forth" (10:19, 23; 12:7, 16); and the phrase, "other gods" (8:8; cf. Ex. 20:3; Jos. 24:2, 16). Wellhausen and Cornill had contended that the Deuteronomist was responsible for chaps. 7 and 12; however, Budde makes the important observation that the Deuteronomist characteristically confines himself to formal editorial additions at the beginning and ending of passages. The Deuteronomist had concluded with the Samson narrative, but the Elohist went directly from Jud. 10, which introduces the Philistine crisis, to I Sam. 1:1.³²

³⁰Ibid., pp. 172-75.

³¹Ibid., pp. 199, 205.

³²Ibid., pp. 180-83, 200.

In a lengthy, detailed article and a subsequent rejoinder to Budde, Carl Cornill reflects the influence of Wellhausen's position although he refines the analysis considerably and argues against a sharp division in the sources over the question of the monarchy. He follows Wellhausen in identifying 9:1-10:16; 11:1-15; 13:1-14:52 as a continuous source. It is generally historical and close to the events it narrates. The source attempts to make a favorable comparison of Saul to David (cf. the list of Saul's achievements in 14:47ff) and is probably Benjaminite.³³ Another source consists of 1:1-7:1 (consequences of the fall of the house of Eli); 8:1-7a, 9-22 and 10:19-24 (the demand for a king and the choice by lot); a report which is now missing on Saul's anointment; and finally 15:1-35 (a prophetic account dependent on the themes of chaps. 1-3). The attitude of this source toward the monarchy is not one of denunciation. In chap. 8 Yahweh accepts the demand for a king. The warning of Samuel about the practices of kings (vv. 11-18) is no more than advice on the dangers of the new order.³⁴ This younger source is Elohist; it merely shifts the focus on events from that of naive piety to prophetic theocracy, in which the prophet Samuel exercises authority over the king. Chaps. 7 and 12 occupy a unique position among the traditions;

³³Carl Cornill, "Ein elohistischer Bericht über die Entstehung des israelitischen Königthums in 1 Samuelis 1-15 aufgezeigt," ZKWL VI (1885), pp. 114-17.

³⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 127-28; "Noch einmal Sauls Königswahl und Verwerfung," ZAW X (1890), 100-01. Cornill deletes 8:7b-8 as a late, Deuteronomic addition.

in these accounts Samuel is judge and intercessor, rather than prophet. He is the only legitimate "ruler" in Israel, and the desire for a king is sinful. Cornill accepts Graf's view that chap. 12 originally concluded the account of the judges. These chapters are not Deuteronomic, however. They date from a period preceding the time of Jeremiah, since Jeremiah knows Samuel as an intercessor (Jer. 15:1) which is a function portrayed only in these chapters.³⁵

The analysis of the sources in I Sam. 1-15 offered by Rudolf Kittel continues the theories of earlier scholars but diverges in ways which anticipate the concerns of recent scholarship for individual circles of traditions within a "source." Kittel accepts the now familiar division of the narratives into two sources, which he designates S (Saul) and SS (Samuel-Saul). He maintains with Graf and Cornill that chaps. 7 and 12 are by a different hand because of Samuel's role as judge in these passages and because of stylistic similarities with the framework of the book of Judges. The writer was a contemporary of Jeremiah.³⁶

Within the two parallel sources are traditions which originally were independent. In the S source, the accounts of Saul's battles in 11:1-15 and 13:1-14:46 constitute such

³⁵Cornill, "Ein elohistischer Bericht," p. 138; "Noch einmal," p. 106.

³⁶Rudolf Kittel, A History of the Hebrews, tr. Hope W. Hogg and E. B. Speirs (London, 1896; tr. of Geschichte des Hebräer, Gotha, 1896), II, 25.

a group. They are the earliest traditions in the source. Kittel asserts that the same author who here speaks of Saul as a mature leader could not have narrated the idyllic account of a wandering boy in 9:1-10:16, which is a later narrative. The accounts in the SS source reflect even greater variations. The basic narrative consists of chaps. 1-3; 8; 10:17-26. The emphasis on Samuel as well as the attitude toward the monarchy is consistent in these passages. On the other hand, the account of the loss of the ark fails to mention Samuel at all. Its independence of theme suggests that it has been added to SS from an older source of which there is no other trace. Kittel assigns the earliest date among the traditions in this source (ninth century) to the ark account, because it equates Yahweh with the ark itself.³⁷ Another passage which differs from the main portion of the source is the account of the dispute between Samuel and Saul at Gilgal (15:1-35). Samuel appears here as a prophet, a forerunner to Amos and Hosea. Kittel dates this second oldest tradition in the source to the eighth century.

Kittel acknowledges that SS bears many affinities with the Elohist source of the Hexateuch, especially in chap. 15. He is not willing to identify SS as a continuation of E, however. The evidence for parallels in themes and terminology only indicates that the author of SS was influenced by the Elohist. While other scholars had accepted the passages in

³⁷Ibid., pp. 31-34.

Kittel's S source as southern in origin, Kittel contends that the emphasis on Saul betrays a northern hand, probably Benjaminite. The accounts in S of Saul's wars could have been written in the time of Saul or David, but the final version of the source with the narrative of Saul's youth appeared later, perhaps in the time of Jeroboam I.³⁸

H. P. Smith continued the view of two independent and originally separate sources behind the narrative of I Sam. 1-15 in his commentary.³⁹ He identifies the sources as Sm and Sl in recognition of the emphasis which is distinct in each. The Samuel source consists not only of the account of Samuel's leadership in Israel and opposition to the monarchy (7:3-17; 8:1-22; 10:17-25; 12:1-25; 15:1-35) but includes the hero's birth and call, as narrated in chapters 1 and 3.⁴⁰ The origin of the traditions in chap. 2 is more difficult. Hannah's Psalm (vv. 1-10) may be confidently assigned to a late editor. The remainder of the chapter tells of the corruption of Eli's house (vv. 12-17, 22-36) and of Samuel's idyllic youth in the service of the temple (vv. 18-21). The passages concerning Eli are not an integral part of the narrative and may have been added by the author from a separate and independent account. Contrary to most scholars, Smith

³⁸Ibid., pp. 33-34.

³⁹H. P. Smith, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel (International Critical Commentary; New York, 1899).

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. xvi-xviii.

denies that the denunciation of Eli by an anonymous prophet (vv. 27-36) is a late addition. The parallel passage in 3:11-14 was added by the author in order to relate this prophecy of doom which he inherited (2:27-36) to Samuel.

The independent account used by the author of the birth and call of Samuel (2:12-17, 22-25, 27-36) continues in 4:1-7:2. The account of the ark and of the fall of Eli's house has little to do with Samuel or Saul. However, in chap. 4 the prophecy against Eli is fulfilled, and in chaps. 5 and 6 the capture of the ark is presumed. Thus, Smith contends that these chapters are part of the Sm source.⁴¹ The Saul source (Sl) does not commence until 9:1-10:16. The narrative style and acceptance of the monarchy as Yahweh's act of deliverance indicate the beginning of an independent source. It continues in 11:1-15 and 13:2-14:52. The historical value of these passages is notable, and Smith characterizes it as "the earliest and most reliable of the sources which relate the origin of the monarchy in Israel."⁴²

In most respects, Smith has accepted the theories of his time. He contends that Sm and Sl are continued in the account of David, however. Furthermore, he disagrees with Budde and Cornill that either source is part of Hexateuchal J or E.⁴³

In his analysis of the sources in the Samuel-Saul narrative, Kittel initiated a trend toward multiple accounts of

⁴¹Ibid., pp. xix-xxi.

⁴²Ibid., p. 59.

⁴³Ibid., pp. xxi-xxii.

the events involved, although he remained an exponent of two sources. Adolphe Lods was the next major scholar to develop the theory of multiple accounts. He does not take exception to the identification of the anti-monarchical source, which derives its perspective on the monarchy not only from experience under the kings of Israel and Judah but also from the prophets who preached of justice and mercy and the perils of reliance upon military power. The perspective of the anti-monarchical source that the monarchy is a form of apostasy is reflected in the lament of Hosea, "O Israel, you have sinned from the days of Gibeah" (10:9).⁴⁴

Within the pro-monarchical account Lods identified two parallel narratives, however. The theory is based upon certain discrepancies and duplications in chaps. 13 and 14. In 13:3, Jonathan defeats the Philistines, yet v. 4 credits the defeat to Saul. In two places (13:16 and 23) we are told that the Philistines assemble for battle at Michmash. Furthermore, the command of Saul to abstain from food (14:24) is obeyed by the people (14:24b), yet an incident where the people furiously eat the spoil is included (14:31-34).⁴⁵

For Lods one account of the Philistine battle begins with Saul's defeat of the Philistine garrison at Gibeah (13:3).

⁴⁴Adolphe Lods, "Les Sources des Recits du Premier Livre de Samuel sur l'Institution de la Royauté Israelite," Etudes de Theologie et d'Histoire (Paris, 1901), pp. 265-69.

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 275-82. Adolphe Lods, Israel, tr. S. H. Hooke (New York, 1932; tr. of Israel des origines au milieu du VIII^e siecle, Paris, 1930), pp. 352-53.

The Philistines come forth to wage war, but an earthquake reduces the camp to panic (13:17-22; 14:15). The Hebrews whom the Philistines had conscripted return to Saul's forces (14:21-22, 23b). This account ends with a demonstration of Saul's zeal for Yahweh. He warns the people, "Cursed be the man who eats food until it is evening and I am avenged on my enemies" (14:24a). The people disobey and devour the spoil captured from the Philistines. Saul offers sacrifice to atone for the deed (14:31-35). The source, which Lods calls the Jabesh source, includes Saul's victory at Jabesh-Gilead (11:1-11), as well as an account of Saul's birth (1:1-28). Lods accepts the view that I Sam. 1 originally narrated Saul's birth, since the etymology of the child's name more nearly approximates "Saul" than "Samuel."

The second account of the battle at Michmash begins with Saul's defeat of the garrison at Gibeah and his muster of the Israelites (13:3b-5; Lods amends "Jonathan" to "Saul" in 3a). The Philistines assemble at Michmash (13:23). The Israelite cause is championed by Jonathan, who reduces the entire Philistine camp to panic (14:1-23a). Jonathan did not hear his father's command against eating although the other Israelites obey (14:24). Jonathan's sinful deed is discovered by casting of lots. Saul desires to kill him in punishment, but the people ransom his life (14:25-30, 36-46). This narrative is the older version, and it would be expected that Saul was crowned king for his brilliant success. The account is missing from the text but is presumed by 14:47, "Therefore, when

Saul had assumed the kingship over Israel. . . ." Just as the Jabesh source is preceded by a story from Saul's youth, the "seer source," as Lods calls it, is an expression of the doubtless historical fact that Israel viewed her king as a gift of deliverance from Yahweh (cf. 9:16).⁴⁶

In 1932 Ivar Hylander published a lengthy and intricate analysis of the "literarische Samuel-Saul Komplex (I Sam. 1-15)" in which he identified four major stages in the development of the narrative.⁴⁷ The oldest account was based on earlier independent traditions, notably Benjaminite accounts of Saul's birth,⁴⁸ the conflict with the Philistines, the selection of Saul (primarily in chaps. 9-10), and the censures of Saul. Hylander differs from the majority of scholars in seeing a primarily theocratic and pietistic theme in these, the oldest accounts of the rise of the monarchy. Such concerns also dominate the second layer of traditions. This layer does not consist of new material, nor is the theocratic perspective altered. The account arises from special historical circumstances, however. Hylander derives this account from priestly circles at Anathoth whither Abiathar fled after Solomon exiled him for his opposition (I Kgs. 2:26). The Abiathar strand reflects the political tension between north

⁴⁶Lods, "Les Sources," pp. 282-83.

⁴⁷Ivar Hylander, Der literarische Samuel-Saul Komplex (I Sam. 1-15) traditions-geschichtlich untersucht (Leipzig, 1932).

⁴⁸Hylander contends that chap. 1 originally applied to Saul. Ibid., pp. 12ff.

and south and the religious opposition to the monarchy in the age of Solomon. In this layer is included most of chap. 8 with its theme that monarchy is a rejection of Yahweh. Samuel's defense of himself (12:1-5), the list of abuses of kings (8:11-18), and Samuel's role as judge (7:15-16; 8:2) are part of this account which Hylander labels as "Yahwist" because of its setting in events of the united monarchy. An important theme in this early edition of the events involving Samuel and Saul is that Samuel acts against his own judgment in establishing the monarchy. His opposition to the monarchy reflects his conviction that this new institution threatens his own position in Israel.⁴⁹

A third strand of traditions that is added to the previous accounts comes from an Elohist circle of the time of Jeremiah. Samuel, like Jeremiah, is the true prophet in contrast to the false men of God. Hylander distinguishes two stages in the formulation of the strand. The first includes the account of Samuel's youth in the temple and his prophetic call. Furthermore, Saul is continually tested beginning with the battle with the Jabeshites. Saul's success is later nullified by his failure to obey the laws of Yahweh and the commands of Samuel. In 15:22-31 Samuel rejects Saul for substituting sacrifice for obedience. A second stage in this account is the portrayal of Samuel as victor over the Philistines (chap. 7) and the mediator of Yahweh's covenantal demands on

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 218-27.

his people (12:7-25). In this respect, Hylander agrees with other scholars that 7:3-17 and 12:1-25 in the main are late.⁵⁰

The fourth and final editing of the traditions is a priestly codification that views Saul's selection as a choice by lot, conducted at Mizpah (10:17-27). It underscores the disfavor into which Saul fell by adding the account of his rebuke at Gilgal (13:7b-15). Furthermore, Samuel's rejection of Saul in chap. 15 is elaborated to include the dispute over the ban in the war against the Amalekites.

A basic premise of Hylander's study is that the account before us does not consist of independent sources but represents the expansion of a basic core of tradition. The motif which lies at the heart of the narrative and dominates all aspects of its elaboration is that of God's lordship and power. He speaks through his servant Samuel, who is variously seer, judge, man of God. Because the man of God is the hero, the role of the king is secondary, and ultimately Saul fails. "Die stärkste Macht gegen den Feind sind nicht die Waffen und die kühne Tat, sondern allein die bussfertige Gesinnung und das fromme Gebet des Glaubens zu Jahwe."⁵¹

Adolphe Lods had divided the pro-monarchical account in I Sam. 1-15 into two distinct narratives. A similar conclusion is reached by Otto Eissfeldt, although his analysis assumes greater significance because of its place within

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 45-46, 227-33, 309-14.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 273.

Eissfeldt's theory of three narrative sources in the Pentateuch and the historical books. According to Eissfeldt, the narrative portions of the Pentateuch that can be assigned to J and E, after the removal of Priestly and Deuteronomic material, do not exhaust the accounts. What remains is the L source, which is the least interested in cultic and priestly matters and directly reflective of tribal history (e.g., the dispute between Jacob and the inhabitants of Shechem, Gen. 34). The L source includes such accounts as the story of the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11:1-9), the account of three visitors to Abraham and the destruction of three thousand Israelites by the sons of Levi (Ex. 33:25-29), and the account of Israelite spies sent to survey the land of Canaan (Num. 13). The commitment of L to the nomadic life, as well as its "particularly crude and archaic" style indicate that it is oldest of the Pentateuchal sources.⁵² Eissfeldt did not initially contend that Pentateuchal L, J, and E were present in the Books of Samuel. Three years prior to the publication in 1934 of his Einleitung in das Alte Testament Eissfeldt presented his theory of "Die Komposition der Samuelisbücher" in which he simply labelled three parallel strands as "I, II, III."⁵³ However, the sources identified

⁵² Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament. An Introduction, tr. Peter R. Ackroyd (New York, 1965; tr. of Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 3rd edition, Tübingen, 1964), pp. 191, 194-99.

⁵³ Otto Eissfeldt, Die Komposition der Samuelisbücher (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 56-62.

in this way are presented as continuations of L, J, and E in his Einleitung.⁵⁴

The Elohist account begins with the birth and call narratives. The latter divide into portions which emphasize Samuel and Eli himself as the central figures in the narrative on the one hand and the sons of Eli, with no mention of Samuel, on the other. The former is characteristic of E, which Eissfeldt identifies in 1:1-3a, 4-28; 2:11; 18b-21; 3:1-21. Unlike his predecessors, Eissfeldt concludes that E does not continue with the account of the loss of the ark (chaps. 4-6), since Samuel is not mentioned. Accordingly E continues directly with 7:3-17.⁵⁵ The account of the rise of the monarchy and Samuel's controversy with Saul is narrated by E in 8:1-22; 10:17-21ab; 12:1-25; 15:1-35.⁵⁶ In Eissfeldt's view, therefore, these passages are consistent in their view of the monarchy; neither chap. 7 nor 12 is a later addition.

The J narrative in the opening chapters of I Samuel begins with the story of Eli's sons at Shiloh and the prophecy of doom (1:3b; 2:12-17, 22-25, 27-36). It continues with the capture of the ark and the death of Hophni and Phinehas (4:4b, 11-14, 16, 17-20, 22). J narrates the suffering of the Philistines because of the ark (5:1, 6-12) and the decision to return it with tumors and mice as a guilt offering (6:2b-4, 12, 13, 14,

⁵⁴Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 271ff.

⁵⁵Eissfeldt, Die Komposition, pp. 5-6.

⁵⁶On the identification of two narrative strands in 10:17-27, see below, p. 124.

16, 17, 18a, 19a, 20b). The Yahwist account of Saul's kingship begins with his selection by Samuel (9:1-10:16). Then the spirit of God seizes Saul (11:6a), and he leads the Israelites into battle against the Philistines (13:3ba, 4b-5). The account concludes with a rejection of Saul who has failed the test of obedience; Yahweh has chosen a new king (13:7b-15). Thus, J and E both conclude their narrative with an account of Saul's rejection.⁵⁷

The remainder of chaps. 1-15 is assigned to L, the earliest source and the one closest to the actual events, particularly with regard to Saul's role as king. Eissfeldt argues that the accounts of victories over the Ammonites (chap. 11) and the Philistines (chaps. 13-14, in the main) are "undoubtedly closer to reality" than J's account of the search for asses and the rejection.⁵⁸ As prelude to Saul's victories, L narrates an account of the ark in Philistine hands (5:2-5; 6:1, 2a, 5-11, 12a, 14a, 15, 18b, 19, 20a, 21; 7:1, 2a) and Saul's election as king by lot (10:21bβ-27). An important aspect of the source is the absence of any account of Saul's failure as king or his rejection. Indeed, it concludes with a summary of his considerable successes (14:47-51).

In spite of the more complex theories of Lods, Hylander, and Eissfeldt, most scholars continued to find two parallel sources or at most two sources with Deuteronomistic additions

⁵⁷Eissfeldt, Die Komposition, pp. 8-9, 56.

⁵⁸Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 275.

in I Sam. 1-15. In his Introduction to the Old Testament (1941), Robert H. Pfeiffer represents this consensus. Pfeiffer argues for an "early source" which continues the account of the Philistine threat begun in Jud. 13-16; thus, the source begins in I Samuel with 4:1. In the theft of the ark, the Philistine attack threatens the very existence of Israel. The response of Yahweh is to send not a judge but a king (9:1-10:16, cf. especially 9:16). The battles of Saul with the Ammonites (chap. 11) and the Philistines (chaps. 13-14) follow naturally upon the choice of Saul as deliverer for Israel. The narratives of Saul's succession to the throne are but a beginning of this source, which is a remarkably vivid and accurate portrayal of the reigns of Saul and David. It continues through the establishment of Solomon's rule (I Kgs. 2:13-46).⁵⁹ Pfeiffer denies that the source is a continuation of J. Nevertheless it is a product of the court of David and Solomon, perhaps written by Abiathar or Ahimaaz. Pfeiffer stresses the objectivity of the account. The author does not allow his faith to prejudice his narrative.⁶⁰

The opposite is true for Pfeiffer's "late source," which begins with Samuel's birth (I Sam. 1) and ends with his death (25:1a). David and Saul are the heroes of the early source, but here it is Samuel the judge (chaps. 1-12) and prophet

⁵⁹Robert H. Pfeiffer, An Introduction to the Old Testament (New York, 1941), pp. 342-46, 356.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 358.

(chaps. 13-24). This late source in I Sam. 1-15 comprises the birth and call (chaps. 1-3, minus 2:27-36); Samuel's victory over the Philistines (7:3-16); the demand for a king and the choice by lot (8:1-22; 10:17-26). Samuel's speech of judgment against king and people follows immediately (12:1-25). The incident at Gilgal (15:1-35) demonstrates again the theme of the source that Samuel is ruler, the supreme figure in Israel. Two theological principles dominate this source and distort its historical view: the kingship is apostasy, and a man's fortune depends on his faithfulness to God. Accordingly Samuel denounces the kingship, and Saul's fate is that of one rejected by Yahweh. Pfeiffer gives no credence to the source. For example, he views the events of chap. 7 as simply an invention by the author. Furthermore, Samuel's position as a national leader is simply a fiction. His historical role was that of a "local clairvoyant."⁶¹

Pfeiffer denies that the "late source" is actually an independent and parallel account. He believes that it supplements the primary source in much the same way that P does in Genesis. One reason for this conclusion is the presence of several lacunae, which would be avoided in a consecutive account. For example, the prophecy against the house of Eli in 3:11-14 remains unfulfilled in the passages by the author.⁶²

Pfeiffer identifies the hand of the Deuteronomic editor

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 362-63.

⁶²Ibid., pp. 364-65.

throughout the books of Samuel and Kings. In the narrative before us, the Deuteronomist has contributed the account in chap. 8, which comes immediately after the exploits of Samuel as the last of the judges. In addition, the Deuteronomist has added a major speech which summarizes the period of the judges and brings that era in Israel's history to a close.⁶³ In this view of chap. 12, he follows the position of Karl Graf many years earlier.

Since its publication in 1943, Martin Noth's study of the Deuteronomist's historical work in Deuteronomy through II Kings has occupied a central position in scholarship on the sources of these books.⁶⁴ The Deuteronomist is not an author but rather one who edited and arranged inherited traditions in such a manner as to produce a history of Israel from the exodus to the exile that reflects his theological and historical perspectives. On occasion the Deuteronomist adds his own passages to the narrative, and among the "Merkmale" of his work is the major speech by a leader of Israel at the beginning or ending of each important period in Israel's history. Thus, Jos. 1 inaugurates the period of the conquest, Jos. 23 concludes the conquest and introduces the period of the Judges. Solomon's "prayer" in I Kgs. 8:14ff is a Deuteronomic composition to emphasize the meaning of the temple for

⁶³Ibid., pp. 365-66.

⁶⁴Martin Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Darmstadt, 1963; reprint of German edition, 1957).

the present and the future.⁶⁵

In his analysis of I Sam. 1-12 Noth returns to the views of Graf and Wellhausen. The early and historical accounts in these chapters (i.e., the ark narrative, 4:1-7:1, followed by 9:1-10:16; 10:27b-11:15) have been supplemented by the Deuteronomist. He accepts Wellhausen's contention that 7:2-8:22; 10:17-27a; 12:1-25 are homogeneous passages bearing the language and viewpoint of the Deuteronomist.⁶⁶ The attitude toward the kingship reflects the Deuteronomist's own perspective in the early sixth century, therefore. Noth contends that he has fundamentally misrepresented the situation surrounding the origin of the monarchy.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, Noth does not take the extreme position of some scholars, such as Pfeiffer, in denying any validity to these passages. In certain instances, the Deuteronomist has incorporated older traditions into his narrative. He apparently knew a tradition about Samuel as one who proclaimed the law, on the basis of the reference to his circuit in 7:16-17. The main theme of the chapter is the Deuteronomist's portrayal of Samuel who "judged Israel" (7:6, 15) after the manner of the "major" judges, however. Samuel's victory over the Philistines is the last of the great deeds of the judges. In the narrative

⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 4-11.

⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 54-55.

⁶⁷Martin Noth, History of Israel, tr. P. R. Ackroyd (New York, 1958; tr. of Geschichte Israels, 2nd edition, Göttingen, 1954), pp. 172-73, especially f.n. 2.

of the choice of Saul by lot (10:17-27a), an older tradition of Saul's selection on the basis of his height (10:21b β -27) has been incorporated by the Deuteronomist into the narrative.⁶⁸

Noth does not deny that opposition to the monarchy existed in the time of Samuel and Saul, even though he argues that the Deuteronomist's view of the period distorts this opposition.⁶⁹ The feelings of some Israelites are illustrated in 10:27a, "But some worthless fellows said, 'How can this man save us?' And they despised him and brought him no present."

This brief reference provided the Deuteronomist with the opportunity to add the account of Saul's victory over the Ammonites and his public acclaim (10:27b-11:15) from the early source. It logically precedes Samuel's final speech in 12:1-25.⁷⁰

Samuel's speech marks the end of the period of the judges and the beginning of the age of monarchy. Noth returns to Graf's theory that 12:1-25 is a creation of the Deuteronomist and parallels such speeches as those in Jos. 1 and Jos. 23.⁷¹ As would be expected, the author reviews the history of the period of the judges with a list of oppressors

⁶⁸Here Noth follows Eissfeldt's thesis, although Noth denies that the piece originally existed independently. See below, p. 124.

⁶⁹Noth, History, pp. 172-73.

⁷⁰Noth, Studien, pp. 58-59.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 10.

and the deliverers (vv. 9-11).⁷² Noth discusses the connection of the need for a king to the Ammonite threat (v. 12). Because this contradicts the Deuteronomist's view of events, v. 12a might be an addition by an editor who sought to combine two originally independent accounts. With this deletion the text does not read smoothly, however: v. 11 "And Yahweh sent Jerubba'al and Barak, and Jephthah, and Samuel and delivered you out of the hand of your enemies on every side; and you dwelt in safety . . . (v. 12b) and you said to me, 'No, but a king shall reign over us,' when Yahweh your God was your king." Furthermore, Noth contends that the Deuteronomic passages do not consist of an independent account but are dependent on the earlier narrative. Hence, he contends that the Deuteronomist only belatedly realized the relation of the Ammonite victory to the issue of kingship and accordingly noted it in this passage.⁷³

In 1952 Gustav Hölscher published his study of "Geschichtsschreibung in Israel." He identified three major narrative strands not only in the Pentateuch but in the historical books, Joshua - II Kings, as well. Only two of these are complete narratives: the Yahwist and the Elohist, which is designated "E₁." In addition to the material that can be assigned to these two narratives, Hölscher finds numerous

⁷²Noth accepts MT's reading of "Samuel" as one of the judges, because it is the more difficult reading. *Ibid.*, p. 59, f.n. 5. See below, p. 107.

⁷³*Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

passages which are related to E_1 in viewpoint and to some extent in language but nevertheless stand apart. They may be insertions which disrupt the continuity of the basic source or elaborations of the narrative in E_1 . Hölscher contends that a distinct terminology unites the passages assigned to E_2 and distinguishes them from the basic Elohist source. This terminology includes the command to "turn aside from foreign gods" (Gen. 35:2; Jos. 24:23; I Sam. 7:3, 4); use of the verbs m's (Num. 11:20; I Sam. 8:7), bhr (Jos. 24:15; Jud. 10:14), htysbw (Num. 11:16; Dt. 31:14; I Sam. 12:7, 16); and above all the rehearsal of Yahweh's saving deeds (Jos. 24:2-22; Jud. 11:12-28; I Sam. 12:8-11).⁷⁴

In terms of theology, E_2 contributes certain new perspectives, notably a view of "all Israel" which culminates in the thought of the Deuteronomist. This is the reason that E_2 frequently recalls Israel's past and Yahweh's deeds of deliverance. The period of wilderness wandering and settlement emerge as the ideal for Israel's later life. E_1 reflects the stern logic that Israel has fallen because of her disobedience. E_2 adds a note of hope to this view. Thus, Samuel assures Israel, "Yahweh will not reject His people for His great name's sake" (12:22). The promise of yet a new king (15:28) is from the pen of E_2 , as well as the

⁷⁴Gustav Hölscher, Geschichtsschreibung in Israel (Lund, 1952), pp. 259-61.

praise of Solomon in which the queen of Sheba speaks of God's love forever: "Because Yahweh loved Israel for ever, he has made you king. . . ." (I Kgs. 10:9).⁷⁵

The identification of the Yahwist in the Samuel-Saul narratives requires little elaboration, since Hölscher generally follows the outline of a pro-monarchical or Saul source set forth by previous scholars. Certain aspects of his analysis are noteworthy, however. In the account of the loss of the ark, Hölscher finds two narratives. The Yahwist narrative consists of an account of the battle of Aphek and the death of the family of Eli, followed by the birth of Ichabod and the adventures of the ark in the temple of Dagon (5:2-5). Hölscher does not explain his reasons for rejecting the unity of these chapters, in spite of the fact that his analysis of chap. 4 consists of unusually minute distinctions.⁷⁶ The account of Saul's battle with the Philistines (13:1-14:52) is part of the J narrative with the exception of three passages, 13:7b-15; 13:9-22; and 14:47-52. The first of these is Saul's rebuke at Gilgal, which is inappropriate for the pro-Saul narrative. Hölscher assigns the claim in 13:19-22 that the Israelites had no iron weapons to a late editor because it is historically

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 264-69.

⁷⁶The Yahwist account of the loss of the ark and its return appears in 4:1a, 1b⁸, 2a⁸_Y, 3a⁸_Y, 4, 6b, 7b, 10a⁸_Y, 12b, 13a⁸_Y, 14b, 16a⁸_b, 17a⁸_Y, 18a⁸₈, 19-21; 5:2-5; 6:1, 2a. Ibid., p. 25.

questionable, in light of Israel's successes in chap. 14. The Deuteronomist has added the summary of Saul's deeds in 14:47-52, although a similar passage may originally have been part of the source.⁷⁷

Most of the material which remains is assigned to either E_1 or its supplement, E_2 . E_1 narrates Samuel's birth and call. This is followed by an account of the loss of the ark, the plagues suffered by the Philistines, and the ark's return. Hölscher accepts Cornill's arguments that the literary style of 7:2-16 indicates that it is not Deuteronomic. Samuel's confrontation with the elders over the demand for a king (8:1-22) is a direct continuation of chap. 7. Both are assigned to E_2 .

In a departure from the general agreement of scholars with regard to 10:17-27, Hölscher views it as generally sympathetic to the monarchy, although he deletes vv. 18-19 in which Samuel speaks of the people's rejection of God. Since the account of E_1 in chap. 15 presumes the anointment of Saul, Hölscher assigns 10:17, 20-27 to that source. On the other hand, Hölscher views 12:1-25 as an addition to the narrative by E_2 . The terminology of the passage illustrates the close affinities of E_2 with the Deuteronomist. A motif of hope is included in spite of opposition to the monarchy (12:22), and the lengthy recital of Yahweh's saving deeds is

⁷⁷Hölscher, op. cit., pp. 365-69.

characteristic of E_2 . In chap. 15, E_1 narrates most of the account. A prominent characteristic of E_1 is its close relation to the thought of Israel's prophets. Israel lives under an obligation of obedience to Yahweh, which is the antithesis of external rituals of sacrifice. Samuel's rebuke of Saul in 15:22-23 for Saul's reliance on sacrifice amply illustrates this characteristic of E_2 .⁷⁸

In addition to 12:1-25, E_2 makes one other long addition to the Samuel-Saul narratives. Hölscher assigns 7:3-16 and 8:1-7, 9-22a to this author. The pattern of apostasy, plea for deliverance, repentance, and victory over the enemy, which is set forth by E_2 in Jud. 10:11-18, is the framework for the events in chap. 7 as Samuel leads Israel to defeat of the Philistines.⁷⁹ The command to "put away foreign gods" (7:3, 4) is found in other passages by this author, such as Jos. 24:23 and Jud. 10:14. The verb m's is characteristically used of Israel's apostasy by E_2 (cf. Num. 11:20). The events narrated in 8:1-7, 9-22a, in which the kingship is portrayed as a rejection of Yahweh, are a direct continuation of the narrative of Samuel's victory over the Philistines.⁸⁰

Opposition to the monarchy is most pronounced in E_2 .

⁷⁸Ibid., pp. 237-39.

⁷⁹Ibid., pp. 262, 264-66, 366.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 366.

Thus, Hölischer assigns the brief pericope of Samuel's rejection of Saul (15:24-31) to this author. These verses repeat the rejection already stated in v. 23. Furthermore, the reference to Yahweh's repentance in 15:11 directly contradicts 15:29, where it is said that Yahweh does not repent like a man.⁸¹

Our discussion of source analysis in I Sam. 1-15 has revealed general agreement among scholars on the presence of at least one continuous source, and generally two. However, most recently scholars have challenged this literary-critical approach and denied the existence of sources. One of the first scholars to contend for a heterogeneous collection of traditions in the Samuel-Saul narratives was Hans W. Hertzberg in his commentary in Das Alte Testament Deutsch series.⁸² He contends that differences in viewpoint and narrative style make it impossible to identify a consistent source. Instead the traditions have derived from various sanctuaries which were prominent after the destruction of Shiloh.

Thus, at Mizpah traditions were formulated and preserved that were critical not only of the king but also of

⁸¹Ibid., p. 369.

⁸²Die Samuelisbücher (Altes Testament Deutsch, 10; Göttingen, 1960). Page references are to the English translation: I & II Samuel, tr. J. S. Bowden (Philadelphia, 1964).

the monarchy as a form of government. These consist of the narrative of Samuel's deeds as the last judge (7:2-17), the demand for a king (8:1-22), and the choice of Saul by lot in 10:17ff, which is the direct continuation of 8:1-22.⁸³ Hertzberg acknowledges that these chapters may reflect the hand of the Deuteronomist in their present form. Nevertheless he contends that the theological view of kingship which is dominant in these passages was part of the inherited material. In other words, the Deuteronomist has not altered the account noticeably.⁸⁴

Another major sanctuary of the time of Samuel was Gilgal. The traditions associated with this cult center are the narratives of victory over the Ammonites (11:1-15 LXX) and the account of Saul's rejection in chap. 15.⁸⁵ The points of similarity between the two chapters include the absence of any mention of Philistine battles and the involvement of Samuel in the establishment of kingship. Saul is enthroned in 11:15. The author refers to this anointment in 15:1. Hertzberg contends that the two passages are not dissimilar

⁸³Ibid., pp. 65-66, 87, 130-31.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 74.

⁸⁵Samuel's rebuke of Saul in 13:7b-15 also occurs at Gilgal. This passage appears in the context of the Philistine battles, however. It may have been located at Gilgal because of the earlier rejection story from that sanctuary. Ibid., p. 131.

in their attitude toward the king, although most scholars have linked chap. 15 with the anti-Saul passages. The basis for Saul's rejection is clear and just. Saul has allowed the people to take the herem from the scene of battle and use it as a sacrifice. Furthermore, Samuel shows compassion toward Saul. The "word of Yahweh" that Saul has sinned plunges Samuel into agony: "And Samuel was angry; and he cried to Yahweh all night" (15:11b).⁸⁶

Hertzberg does not identify the origin of the traditions of Saul's Philistine battles (13:1-14:46), of the birth and call (1:1-3:21), or of the ark narrative (4:1-7:1). He follows recent scholarship in viewing the account of the battle of Aphek and the fate of the ark (4:1-7:1) as distinct from the preceding chapters. The narrator's exclusive attention upon the fate of the ark suggests the appropriateness of Leonhard Rost's thesis that this is the beginning of a narrative of the ark sanctuary.⁸⁷ The young hero of the birth and call narrative remains unmentioned in these chapters. Nor is there any trace of the offenses of Hophni and Phinehas which were so prominent in the preceding chapters.⁸⁸

In the narrative of Samuel's birth and call two prominent themes are interwoven: the downfall of the house of Eli

⁸⁶Ibid., pp. 123-24, 127-28.

⁸⁷Leonhard Rost, Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids (Stuttgart, 1926).

⁸⁸Hertzberg, Samuel, pp. 46-47.

and the advent of the prophet Samuel. These may originally have been separate, although the "final compiler" knew the account as a unity. The only exceptions to this were the prophecy of the priesthood of Zadok (2:27-36), which was written by a later editor who knew that Samuel's sons did not succeed him (cf. 8:1-3), and the Song of Hannah (2:1-10).⁸⁹

Chap. 12 stands alone among the traditions, in Hertzberg's view. It is the work of the Deuteronomist, who has carried out the consequences of the anti-monarchical view of the Mizpah traditions. The demand for obedience of king and people to Yahweh is the same theme which the Deuteronomist applied in evaluating all the kings of Israel and Judah. "The standpoint of the preacher and his audience accordingly lies in the time after 587."⁹⁰

In recent years the most extensive discussion of Samuel's role in Israel and especially in the establishment of the monarchy has come from Artur Weiser.⁹¹ His analysis necessarily involves the larger question of the presence of sources. Weiser repeatedly emphasizes the diversity of style

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 43-44.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 100.

⁹¹ Artur Weiser, Samuel. Seine geschichtliche Aufgabe und Religiöse Bedeutung (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments; Göttingen, 1962).

and variety of perspective which characterize the traditions in I and II Samuel. Although the heterogeneous nature of the accounts precludes identification of any continuous literary sources, various groups of traditions are evident. Among these one of the earliest is the narrative of Saul's rise to kingship in 9:1-10:16; 11:1-15; 13:1-14:46. This group consists of originally separate elements, however. Whereas 9:1-10:16 is a "popular saga," 11:1-15 is a "historical narrative." The emphasis in 13:1-14:46 differs from either. These military accounts of Saul's wars with the Philistines are only loosely connected with his rise to political power, as the fulfillment of the task for which he was anointed.⁹²

Weiser finds even more variety of viewpoint among the passages in I Sam. 1-15 which other scholars had identified as part of a source opposed to the monarchy. In these passages, Samuel appears in a number of presumably exclusive roles: priest, prophet, judge. In chap. 7 Samuel as a judge is linked to the historical crisis of the Philistines. Although it arose from the sanctuary at Mizpah, the narrative clearly has nothing to do with the question of a king (cf. 10:17-26). Nor can it be considered a prelude to 8:1-22 since Samuel's victory over the Philistines is not even mentioned in the dispute over kingship.⁹³ The narrative of the

⁹²Weiser, The Old Testament, pp. 162-63.

⁹³Weiser, Samuel, pp. 7-8, 27-28.

elders and Samuel at Ramah (8:1-22) is not related to the Philistine crisis. The demand for a king arises because the sons of Samuel are unworthy (8:3). The purpose of the narrative is to establish the framework for the succeeding passages. The theme of a conflict between Samuel and the people, which is narrated here, appears in different forms in the account of the choice by lot and in Samuel's speech in 12:1-25. The claim that Israel's demand for a king is a rejection of God occurs in all three narratives (8:7; 10:19; 12:12), but the context is different each time: in 8:1-22, an assembly of the elders at Ramah; in 10:17-27, an assembly of the people at Mizpah; in 12:1-25, in a reference to the Ammonite threat.⁹⁴

The scene of the choice by lot (10:17-26) scarcely follows from the preceding account of Saul's anointment and must be an independent narrative with its own history. Nor can it be linked with chap. 8. In 10:19, the author specifically notes that the demand for a king has come today at Mizpah. This account, which was preserved at Mizpah, is a sanctuary legend in which Samuel calls the people before Yahweh and not only selects a king but proclaims the sacred law for the new order in society.⁹⁵ In this way Samuel presides over the establishment of the monarchy. As one entrusted with Israel's sacred traditions, he reminds the king

⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 28-29.

⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 62-63.

of his obligations before God.

The same theme appears in chap. 12 where Samuel proclaims the covenantal obligations (vv. 14-15) to which the people and the king remain subject in spite of the momentous change in their corporate life. Samuel clearly intends to continue in his role as intercessor and covenant mediator; he avows that he will not cease "to pray for you . . . and instruct you in the good and right way" (12:23).⁹⁶ While the narrative of the choice by lot was preserved at Mizpah, this parallel account of Samuel's role in the establishment of the new order probably comes from Gilgal, in light of the reference to this sanctuary at the close of chap. 11. The context of chap. 12 differs from that in 10:17-26, in spite of similarity of theme. The setting is a cultic act of covenant renewal, in which the recital of Israel's Heilsgeschichte and the confession of sin are prominent factors. Weiser rejects the view of Wellhausen and Noth that the passage is a Deuteronomic fiction. He sees it as part of an attempt to present and interpret the events of the time in accord with the theology of Israel's covenant with her only true King.⁹⁷ This theological outlook is also found in the Elohist source. It derives from prophetic

⁹⁶Ibid., pp. 83-4, 88-90. Weiser specifically rejects the designation of "Abschiedsrede" which is often applied to this chapter.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 88.

circles "considerably earlier than E."⁹⁸

In its prophetic interpretation of history, chap. 12 is united with the preceding passages (i.e., 7:1-8:22 and 10:17-26), although differences in presentation preclude identification of a single literary source. The earliest passage in this circle of traditions is the account preserved at Gilgal of Samuel's rebuke of Saul (15:1-35). Weiser contends that the narrative goes back to circles around Samuel, because of the intimate knowledge it reveals of the tensions which beset Israel's first monarch.⁹⁹ On the one hand, Saul is portrayed with considerable sympathy. He is at first unaware of his sin, and he is zealous in his loyalty to Yahweh (v. 13). After Samuel has rebuked him for letting the people seize the herem, Saul repents of his sin (v. 30). On the other hand, Yahweh's demand for obedience is unwavering. Samuel reminds the doomed monarch that "the Glory of Israel will not lie or repent; for he is not a man, that he should repent" (15:29). Samuel's precipitate slaughter of Agag demonstrates that Yahweh's will cannot be compromised.¹⁰⁰

The narrator of 15:1-35 observes through these events that Saul failed because he lacked absolute authority as king.

⁹⁸Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 161.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 167.

¹⁰⁰Weiser, "I Samuel 15," pp. 24-27.

The will of Yahweh continued to be identified with the prophet Samuel. Without clear religious sanction as a basis for ruling, Saul was subject to the demands of the people whose support he needed. Whereas Saul could not combine the religious and political basis of power in himself, David was able to do so.¹⁰¹

Certain conclusions may be drawn from the preceding review of source analysis in I Sam. 1-15. In spite of a variety of theories on the precise extent and date of the source, general agreement exists that portions of 7:2-17; 8:1-22; 10:17-27; 12:1-25 and 15:1-35 have characteristics in common. Wellhausen spoke confidently of all but 15:1-35 as "anti-monarchical." Most scholars have emphasized differences in perspective and narrative style among these passages, but even Weiser acknowledges a mode of prophetic interpretation of history which they all share. Often this "source" or layer of tradition has been extended to include the birth and call narratives and even the ark narratives, although recent scholarship has recognized that the latter stand apart in their exclusive interest with the ark itself.

The question of the date of these materials and the related issue of historicity has concerned virtually all scholars. Almost without exception the passages are considered to be of later origin than the narratives which tell

¹⁰¹Ibid.

of Saul's rise to the monarchy and his battles with foreign oppressors. Accordingly most scholars have been highly sceptical of the historical value of the material, although there are numerous exceptions to the extreme position of Wellhausen and Pfeiffer that 7:3-8:22; 10:17-27; and 12:1-25 are simply fictional inventions of the Deuteronomist. Indeed in recent years the trend of scholarship has been to acknowledge historical elements in the author's predominantly theological perspective of the rise of the monarchy (cf. Weiser and even Noth).

Certain issues emerge as the result of recent scholarship especially, although these questions have confronted scholars since the time of Wellhausen. Can a source be identified in the anti-monarchical passages, including the birth and call narratives as well? Or are we faced with various sanctuary traditions, which are notable for their differences in perspective and literary style? If a source does exist, what is its relation to the Hexateuchal source D or E? Some scholars have spoken of the Deuteronomist or the Elohist as the author of the anti-monarchical account, but no serious attempt has been made to base this theory on analysis of terminology or major themes.

Finally the question of Samuel's role in Israel and his relation to the establishment of the monarchy is directly related to the view which one holds on the data and historical importance of anti-monarchical passages. Those scholars who dismiss these passages as a late theological interpretation

of the events surrounding Saul's accession conclude that little or no opposition to the monarchy existed and that Samuel's influence was confined to a small area around Ramah. The scholarship of Artur Weiser on the other hand represents a re-assessment of the role of Samuel on the basis of the historical value of such passages as 7:3-17 and 12:1-25.

CHAPTER III

AN ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT

In this chapter I will present a consideration of numerous textual problems which affect the reading of the Masoretic Text (hereafter MT). The portions of the text which are considered are 1:1-3:21; 7:1-17; 8:1-22; 10:17-27; 12:1-25; 15:1-35. These portions represent the larger context for the anti-monarchical source which is identified in Chapter IV. Such an inquiry is essential not only because the text of Samuel has suffered unusually from "corruption" nor simply because lower criticism must precede other inquiries as the latter's only sure foundation; but also because the discovery of Samuel manuscripts at Qumran has introduced important new data.¹

Portions of two Samuel manuscripts from Qumran have been published by Cross. The one--4QSam^a--dates from the first century B. C. The second--4QSam^b--is significantly older and is one of the earliest Qumran manuscripts. On

¹The published material is not as yet extensive, but the general direction of the evidence is clear. The fragments published to date, with exceedingly helpful analysis, are to be found in the following three articles by Frank M. Cross, Jr.: "A new Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," BASOR 132 (December, 1953), pp. 15-26. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," JBL LXXIV (1955), 147-72. "The History of the Biblical Text," HTR LVII (1964), 281-99.

the basis of the script and orthography of 4QSam^b Cross dates it in the final quarter of the third century B. C. Unlike 4QSam^a, which is a complete manuscript of I and II Samuel, this earlier manuscript contains only seven fragments: 16:1-11; 19:10-17; 21:3-7; 21:8-10; 23:9-17 (three fragments).² As is well known, the textual tradition represented in the Qumran Samuel MSS and in the MSS of the other historical books found in Cave Four is closely related to the Vorlage of LXX.³ Thus in eight cases of readings in 4QSam^b, the Qumran document agrees with LXX against MT. In two cases, 4QSam^b agrees with MT over against LXX.⁴ The significance of the Samuel MSS is not that they establish the superiority of readings in LXX, however. The discovery of 4QSam has established that LXX is a faithful rendering of an authentic "Hebrew textual tradition" of the books of Samuel.⁵

In his initial writings on the subject, Cross indicated that 4QSam belonged in the same textual tradition as the Vorlage of the "Old Greek," i.e., the original versions of LXX (notably Codex Vaticanus).⁶ By 1964 it was possible

²Ibid., pp. 164-65.

³Frank M. Cross, Jr., "A Report on the Biblical Fragments of Cave Four in Wadi Qumran," BASOR 141 (February, 1956), p. 11.

⁴Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts," p. 171.

⁵Cross, "A Report," p. 12.

⁶Cross, "A Report," p. 12. "The Oldest Manuscripts," p. 165.

to be more specific and exact. Examination of 4QSam^a led to the conclusion that its textual affinities were greatest with the Hebrew tradition underlying the recension of Lucian. Among the texts in the Lucian "family" minuscules boc₂e₂ are especially important. Even this pattern is not consistent throughout the Books of Samuel. "In I Sam. 1-II Sam. 11:1, the text of 4QSam^a (and 4QSam^b) follows closely the readings of the family LXX^B, especially when LXX^B and LXX^L agree against MT."⁷ The situation differs for II Sam. 11:2-24:25, however. Here 4QSam^a stands generally with LXX^L against LXX^B, which in turn reflects a Hebrew tradition behind MT.⁸

The implications of the Qumran material for analysis of the text are several. First of all, the direct witness of 4QSam^a is available in those cases where the material has been published, i.e., 1:22b-2:6, 16-25. In addition the witness of LXX must be considered as important, and in some cases decisive. The text of Codex Vaticanus (hereafter LXX^B) which I have used is that given in The Old Testament in Greek.⁹ The standard edition of Lucian's recension is the work of P. de Lagarde (hereafter LXX^L).¹⁰ Because of

⁷Cross, "History of the Biblical Text," p. 292.

⁸Ibid., p. 293.

⁹A. E. Brooke and N. McLean, eds., The Old Testament in Greek (London, 1927), Vol. II, Part I.

¹⁰P. de Lagarde, Librorum Veteris Testamenti canoniorum pars I graece edita (Göttingen, 1833).

the importance which Cross has assigned the minuscules boc_2e_2 (hereafter Luc.) I have noted their witness where it exists. It seemed advisable not to simply equate LXX^{L} and Luc., since Lagarde's edition relies upon other manuscripts and the quotations of Theodoret as well.¹¹ Often LXX^{B} , LXX^{L} , and Luc. agree against MT. In these cases I generally follow the witness of Septuagint. In the instances where LXX^{B} and LXX^{L} disagree, I have tended to favor the Lucian family of texts. This is especially true if LXX^{B} agrees with MT in such cases, because LXX^{B} is hexaplaric, i.e., it is influenced by the Greek text of Origen in which he basically attempted to bring the Greek text into conformity with MT.¹²

1:1-28.

1. The phrase mn-hrmtym swpym presents grammatical and geographical problems. S. R. Driver¹³ and Julius Wellhausen¹⁴ suggest that hrmtym is the equivalent of rmh or rmth, Samuel's home (cf. 1:19; 2:11; 7:17; 8:4; 15:34), although the abrupt change to hrmth in 1:19 is strange. The LXX (Ἀμμαθαίμ) seems to presuppose a dual, i.e., "two

¹¹Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 110-11.

¹²Frederic G. Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, Fourth Edition (London, 1903), pp. 54-55.

¹³Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel (Oxford, 1913), pp. 1-3.

¹⁴Der Text der Bücher Samuelis (Göttingen, 1872), pp. 34-35.

hills." However, this may simply be an artificial form comparable to y^erūsālayim for y^erūsālēm.¹⁵ The precise meaning of the LXX translation is unclear, for throughout I Samuel, Ἀρραθίμ is used not only to translate hrmtym but also all occurrences of hrmth.¹⁶ The best solution seems to be a re-vocalization so as to read "the Ramathites" (hārāmātīm) as the Gibeonites (hagib'ōnīm) in II Sam. 21:2.¹⁷ Clearly unacceptable is the proposal that hrmtym šwpym be read as the name of Samuel's home, for šwpym would stand in apposition.¹⁸ This is unlikely, since šwpym is not feminine.¹⁹ LXX reads Σεῖφά ἐξ ὄρους Ἐφράιμ, prompting the emendation, šwpy: "a Zuphite. . ." The corruption in MT may be from dittography. Wellhausen claims that the designation "Zuphite" is a personification of the land, not an actual family name (cf. I Sam. 9:5, which refers to Ramah in 'rš šwp. In summary, 1:1a may be translated, "There was a certain man from the Ramathites, a Zuphite from the hill country of Ephraim. . ." (cf. Jud. 13:2 for analogous phraseology).²⁰

¹⁵Driver, op. cit., pp. 2-3.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 3.

¹⁷Karl Budde, Books of Samuel, tr. B. W. Bacon (Leipzig, 1894; tn of Die Bücher Samuel, Tübingen, 1902), p. 51.

¹⁸P. A. H. de Boer, Research into the Text of I Samuel I-XVI (Amsterdam, 1938), p. 6.

¹⁹Budde, Books, p. 51. Driver, Notes, p. 1.

²⁰For a similar translation, note Smith, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

bn-yrbm. LXX reads 'λερεμενλ. However, Jeroham is attested in I Chr. 6:12, 19. Beyond this, the three lists in MT of Samuel's ancestry differ: Elihu vs. Eliab (I Chr. 6:12) or Eliel (I Chr. 6:19), and Tohu vs. Nahath (I Chr. 6:11) and Toah (I Chr. 6:19). Driver suggests that the confusion between Tohu and Nahath arose because nun and taw were confused.²¹ LXX^A (Θόου) and Vulgate (Thohu) confirm Samuel text.

'prty. In LXX^B the phrase bn-swp 'prty is rendered as ἐν Ναοῦ β 'Εφραῖμ. Perhaps the writers viewed swp as a place which was located in Ephraim. Accordingly, Wellhausen amends 'prty to 'prym and translates, "son of Zuph of Ephraim."²² However, it must be noted that the meaning of the term 'prty is unclear. The text as it stands is paralleled with 17:12 where it is said of David that he is bn-'yś 'prty hzh mbyt lhm ("son of an Ephrathite from Bethlehem") and with Ruth 1:2 where it is said of Chilion's parents that they were 'prtym mbyt lhm ("Ephrathites from Bethlehem"). The connection of an Ephrathite with Bethlehem, which lies south of Ephraim, makes it difficult to equate "Ephrathite" and "Ephraimite." Therefore, I would not amend the text. Nevertheless until more is known about "Ephrathites" I think it can be assumed that Samuel was an Ephraimite. The reference to "the hill country of Ephraim"

²¹Driver, Notes, p. 4.

²²Wellhausen, Text, p. 35.

in la argues for this. Furthermore, Samuel's home town of Ramah (1:19; 7:17; 8:4) was probably in Ephraim. The location of Ramah is not absolutely certain, but Ramathaim is located by Eusebius and Jerome in the region of Lydda, within the boundaries of Ephraim.²³ The suggestion of Budde that Ramah is er-Ram, five miles north of Jerusalem, is improbable.²⁴ The journey of Saul in 9:3-4 "through the land of Benjamin" and the reference of Samuel to Benjamin in 10:2 indicate that Samuel's home was not within Benjamin, as er-Ram is.

2. 'ht. This term might be more properly written h'ht. Nevertheless, the numeral is definite itself and so may occur without the article.²⁵

3. wšm šny bny-'ly hpny wphš. It is surprising that Eli is not mentioned independently. MT presumes here an earlier reference to the chief priest of Shiloh, especially in light of 1:9 where Eli is again simply mentioned without introduction. Wellhausen conjectured that this was part of a (now lost) larger text.²⁶ LXX (καὶ ἐκεῖ ἦλθὲν οἱ δύο υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ) preserves either a correction in light of a shortened narrative (Wellhausen) or the correct reading. Thenius

²³Driver, Notes, pp. 3-4.

²⁴Budde, Samuel, p. 2.

²⁵E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (Oxford, 1960), 126z and 134l. Hereafter, GK. Cf. also Driver, Notes, p. 5.

²⁶Wellhausen, Text, p. 35.

assumes that 'ly w has dropped out of MT.²⁷

4. LXX^B omits wbnwtyh ("her daughters"), probably because of a scribal error. The phrase is confirmed in LXX^L.

5. 'ht 'pym ky. This phrase has prompted numerous interpretations. Those who avoid emendation read 'pym as "heavily" (cf. Vulgate) or as a dual of "face" meaning two faces or two persons: mnh 'ht 'pym, "one portion of two 'faces'", i.e., a double gift. However, this rendering would be unique among the uses of the word (cf. Gen. 19:1; 42:6; 48:12; Is. 49:23) and an awkward way to express the idea that the one gift is suitable as two.²⁸ The more acceptable solution is to amend 'pym to 'ps, "although" or "nevertheless." This corresponds with LXX πλήν, although the preceding phrase in LXX (ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτῇ παιδίον) is probably an editor's gloss. LXX^L also adds κατὰ πρόσωπον ("face to face") in an attempt to render 'pym. The meaning of the text is therefore that Elkanah gave but one portion to Hannah, even though he loved her.

6. Interpretation of 6a is difficult. Budde dismisses it as a gloss, describing the trials of Hannah's daily life. As evidence he notes the parallel of 5b with 6b.²⁹ ka'as is probably to be re-vocalized as the infinitive absolute

²⁷Otto Thenius, Die Bücher Samuelis. (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, IV; Leipzig, 1964), p. 3.

²⁸Driver, Notes, pp. 7-8.

²⁹Budde, Books, p. 53.

ka'ēs, "her rival vexed her even to anger. . . ." Driver follows MT and reads "she vexed . . . with vexation. . . ." Hence, the noun functions as the more common infinitive absolute to express the extent of the action: "she vexed her bitterly."³⁰ LXX^L reads καὶ γὰρ παρούσῃ ("even provoking to anger"). hr'mh may be the Hiphil infinitive (with suffix) from r'm, meaning "to thunder." According to Driver, the root means to complain or "be indignant" in Syriac. Such a meaning would be appropriate for this passage (for the dagesh in res, cf. GK 22s). Whereas LXX^B presumes simply b'wr zh, LXX^L and the Itala seem to have read herpātāh ("she disdained her"), cf. ἐξουθενεῖν. Smith amends in this way but emendation is not required.³¹ It should be noted that the LXX^B of v. 6 departs markedly from MT, but in such a way (i.e., with numerous repetitions) as to question its reliability.

7. y'sh (LXX ἐποίει) refers to Elkanah's action in vv. 4-5. The form need not be re-vocalized as Niphal (Wellhausen) nor as 3 f.s., referring to Peninnah's actions (as does Vulgate). Probably 'lth should be amended to 'ltm ("they went up"), following the Vulgate. Smith is troubled by the change of subject in the phrase tk'snh wtbkh. He suggests that Hannah's name is represented in the last letters of the

³⁰Driver, pp. 8-9.

³¹Smith, op. cit., p. 8.

first verb, or that the word should be amended to read wtkš hnh.³² However, such proposals are more implausible than the present text. The use of kn....kn here is unusual. Perhaps it is to be read, "Thus he would do.....and like-wise she would vex her."

8. LXX τύπτει σε for yr' is not convincing (contra Smith).³³ The phrase yr' lbbk is paralleled in Deut. 15:10.

9. 'klh bšlh. Scholars have often amended these words in order to achieve agreement with LXX ('klm instead of 'klh)³⁴ and to delete reference to Shiloh. Thus, Wellhausen amends to habb^ošēlāh ("the boiled flesh"; cf. 2:13)³⁵ and Budde amends drastically so that 9a reads wtnh 'klh blškh ("she left her food (uneaten) in the dining room").³⁶ This prepares for the text of 1:18 (in LXX). However, LXX attests to bšlh and it is not particularly redundant (contra Driver)³⁷ since the setting of v. 8 could easily have been outside the environs of Shiloh. Again I would follow LXX in deleting w'hry šth and reading wttysb lpny yhwh, which is entirely appropriate.³⁸ This is derived from LXX^L and Luc. (καὶ κατέστη ἐνώπιον Κυρίου), which also verifies

³²Smith, op. cit., p. 8.

³³Ibid.

³⁴Driver, Notes, pp. 11-12.

³⁵Wellhausen, Text, p. 38.

³⁶Budde, Books, p. 52.

³⁷Driver, Notes, p. 12.

³⁸Ibid. Wellhausen, Text, p. 38.

w'hry šth, however. In 11b, LXX adds after wnttyw, "before you as a gift until the day of his death, and wine and heavy drink he will not drink." This amplification is plausible enough (cf. Num. 3:9; 18:6; 6:3) but it is difficult to explain its deletion from MT.

12. whyh is not correct. The imperfect is to be expected. Scribe may have assumed that future verbs were to continue. Amend to wyhy.³⁹

14. tštkryn. This form of second feminine singular is unusual due to the final nun, found only seven times in Hebrew.⁴⁰ LXX places the question in this verse in the mouth of a "servant boy of Eli." Thenius views this as authentic, in which case MT has shortened the scene to involve Eli only.⁴¹ Such an emendation seems unwarranted. However, at the close of the verse LXX reads very naturally καὶ πορεύου ἐκ πρῶσάπου Κυρίου. This replaces MT m'lyk and is quite convincing.

15. qšt rwh. This may mean "hard-spirited" in the sense of obstinate.⁴² However, most scholars follow LXX (σκληρὰ ἡμέρα) and amend to read qšt yōm, "hard of day," i.e., one accustomed to hard times. (cf. Job 30:25).⁴³

³⁹Budde, Books, p. 28, 52. Wellhausen, Text, p. 39.

⁴⁰Driver, Notes, p. 14.

⁴¹Thenius, op. cit., p. 6.

⁴²Driver, Notes, p. 14.

⁴³Budde, Books, pp. 1, 52. Smith, op. cit., p. 11. Thenius, op. cit., p. 6.

16. lpny. The meaning of the verb in this clause is "to treat as." Hence, lpny is unlikely (but compare Job 3:24, 4:19 where it may have the meaning of "like"). Perhaps we should read kbt,⁴⁴ but no firm evidence for emendation exists. In 16b LXX paraphrases (ὅτι ἐκ πλήθους ἀδολεσχίας μου ἐκτέτακα ἕως νῦν). Its witness does not merit emendation of dbbrty.⁴⁵

18. wtlk...ldrkh wt'kl. As it stands, MT is much too laconic. LXX gives some indication of what has been omitted. Following ldrkh, LXX^B reads καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ κατὰλμα αὐτῆς. Probably the Hebrew read wth' hlškth ("and she came to the dining room..."). LXX^B identified the he locale as the feminine suffix.⁴⁶ The he locale was understood by authors of LXX^L and Luc. which omit αὐτῆς. Accordingly MT should be amended.⁴⁷ Following wt'kl LXX has apparently read 'm 'y^{sh} wtst (".....with her husband and she drank"). This phrase seems too elaborate to be original. I would not amend. As noted in v. 9, Budde amended that verse so that it appeared as if Hannah left her meal early; this emendation (first proposed by Klostermann) was inspired by LXX of v. 18. Thus, Hannah, who had

⁴⁴Driver, Notes, pp. 14-15, Smith, op. cit., p. 11.

⁴⁵Driver, Notes, p. 15, but contra Smith, op. cit., p. 11.

⁴⁶Wellhausen, Text, p. 39.

⁴⁷Smith, however, notes that several Hebrew MSS omit t'kl, and he concludes that, indeed, it is an unnecessary addition to the verse. Smith, op. cit., p. 11.

left abruptly, now returns and rejoins her husband at the table. Klostermann, however, does not accept 'm 'yśh from LXX.⁴⁸ This view of the action however presumes an extensive emendation in v. 9. Furthermore, there is no sure indication that Hannah's family has remained at their meal during the events between vv. 9 and 18.

wpnyh l'-hyw-lh 'wd. LXX expresses the meaning of this phrase by translating τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς οὐ συνέπεσεν ἔτι. This, however, does not require emendation of MT, as proposed by some scholars.⁴⁹

20. The order of events is incorrect. wyhy ltqpw (to be amended to the singular ltqpt, "circuit," "close.") hymym would logically follow hnh. Thus, "Hannah conceived and at the end of the period (i.e., of pregnancy), she bore a son ..."⁵⁰ Wellhausen interpreted ltqpw hymym to refer to "the beginning of a new year," i.e., the time of the feast of Tabernacles. Accordingly the phrase is removed to the beginning of v. 21.⁵¹ LXX reads wt'mr instead of ky, but

⁴⁸D. August Klostermann, Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige (Kurzfassender Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments, III; Nördlingen, 1897), pp. 2-3.

⁴⁹Klostermann, op. cit., p. 18. Smith, op. cit., p. 12. Thenius, op. cit., p. 6.

⁵⁰Budde, Books, p. 53. Driver, Notes, p. 16.

⁵¹Wellhausen, Text, pp. 39-40.

this hardly sounds convincing. Perhaps they were bothered about the etymology of the name and sought to eliminate the explicitly causative ky. A similar expression occurs in Gen. 4:25 where the etymology of Seth's name is given:

wtqr' 't-šmw št ky...

21. 't - zbh hymym. "the annual sacrifice." Cf. 1:3.⁵²

Smith chooses to delete w't - ndrw entirely since Hannah's vow is the only one being mentioned.⁵³ Wellhausen notes that it is an unusual reference.⁵⁴ However, the reference is probably to a customary vow which Elkanah makes each year. Certainly the elaborate phrase of LXX is an unnecessary explication: καὶ πάσας τὰς δεκάτας τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ.

22. With v. 22, we have available the first of the published fragments of 4QSam^a. Unfortunately, few words of this verse remain in the Qumran fragment. 4QSam^a does read 'd 'šr instead of simply 'd. Whereas the former is to be expected with imperfect tense nevertheless 'd plus the perfect is attested in Jud. 16:2.⁵⁵ No emendation is called for. The received text, ky-'mrh l'yšh 'd ygml hn'r whb'tyw, is admittedly elliptical. LXX^L is more explicit about the

⁵²Driver, Notes, p. 20.

⁵³Smith, op. cit., p. 13.

⁵⁴Wellhausen, Text, p. 40.

⁵⁵S. R. Driver, A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew (Oxford, 1892), pp. 134-35.

meaning: "I will not go up until I bring the boy with me, after I have weaned him. . . ." Presumably 4QSam^a contained a similar reading, in which the phrase k'šr gmltyw appears rather than in v. 24 (cf. MT) - if we follow Cross' reconstruction, based on considerations of space.⁵⁶ In spite of these variant readings, the MT remains acceptable.

wnr'h. Smith amends to Qal imperfect since the verb is followed by 't.⁵⁷ However, the construction, Niphal of r'h followed by 't, is attested in Ex. 34:23. Emendation is not warranted.

23. Between vv. 22 and 23, 4QSam^a adds wnttyhw nzyr 'd 'wlm kwl ymy hyyw... ("and I will make him a Nazirite forever, all the days of his life..."). Such an addition is attested elsewhere and may be borrowed from the very similar phraseology of 1:11.⁵⁸

't-dbrw. This should probably read dbrk, i.e., "your word," or promise.⁵⁹

24. Variant readings of this verse raise the question of Elkanah's participation in the events at Shiloh. LXX^L

⁵⁶Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 18.

⁵⁷Smith, op. cit., p. 13.

⁵⁸Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 18.

⁵⁹Budde, Books, p. 53. Driver, Notes, p. 20. Smith, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

clearly speaks of him (καὶ ἀνέβη μετ' αὐτοῦ) in lieu of the Hebrew wt'lh 'mmh. For the redundant whn'r n'r, LXX^{BL} reads τὸ παιδάριον μετ' αὐτῶν.⁶⁰ Such evidence prepares us for the reference to Elkanah in 2:11, which would be inexplicable if MT is followed here. 4QSam^a corroborates the first reading of LXX (l. 6, wt'l 'wtw), although the text is destroyed at the close of v. 24. Klostermann⁶¹ and Budde⁶² remove the phrase whn'r 'mh ("and the boy with her") to the end of v. 25, because v. 25 in LXX has for its subject "Hannah, the mother." However, the reading of LXX seems the more likely: whn'r 'mm. Furthermore LXX^L retains a lengthy description at the beginning of v. 25 of the family sacrificing before Yahweh: "...they drew near before Yahweh, and his father sacrificed the offering which he annually presented to Yahweh. And they presented the boy (hn'r) and sacrificed the calf. Then Hannah the mother of the boy went to Eli."⁶³ A portion of the Hebrew text may have been omitted because of the occurrence in two places of hn'r (cf. Cross' reconstruction, ll. 8, 10).⁶⁴

⁶⁰Klostermann, op. cit., p. 3.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Budde, Books, pp. 1, 53.

⁶³LXX^B differs in its translation by reading "she presented . . . she sacrificed." This confusion may have arisen from the use of a tqtl form of the dual in the Hebrew Vorlage.

⁶⁴Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 26.

The same account which LXX^L preserves was probably present in 4QSam^a although the text is now almost entirely defective. However, the key words hzbh (1. 9) and wyšht (1. 10) remain and an appropriate reconstruction conforms with the space requirements.⁶⁵ Since it is attested in 4QSam^a and the evidence for haplography is probable, the addition to MT should be made. This addition includes emendation of 25a in order to conform with the last sentence of LXX^L, quoted above. wyby'w should be amended to wtb' and 't amended to 'm.⁶⁶

bprym šlšh. In accordance with LXX (ἐν μόσχῳ τριετίῳ) and 4QSam^a and with v. 25, this should be amended to read bpr mšllš ("with a three year old bull"). As Driver notes, the original orthography may have omitted the yodh, thus making the error simply one of grouping the letters, although this does not account for hē.⁶⁷ Probably wlhm should be added following mšllš, in accordance with the Hebrew tradition of 4QSam^a and LXX^L (καὶ ἄρτοις).

✓ wtb'hw. LXX^L and Luc. read εἰσῆλθον. Cross follows this and suggests a tqtl form of the dual, i.e., wtb' ("and they went"),⁶⁸ although this portion of 4QSam^a is missing.

⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 19-20, 26.

⁶⁶Driver, Notes, p. 21. Wellhausen, Text, p. 41.

⁶⁷Driver, Notes, p. 20.

⁶⁸Cross, "A Biblical Fragment," pp. 19-20.

k'sr gmltw need not be omitted, although it does not appear in LXX. It is no more redundant than is 23b!

28. hyh hw' should probably read hy hw'. Driver suggests that hw' goes with what follows, however.⁶⁹ Probably the original phrase was hy hw' hw' and the scribe omitted the second pronoun.

wysthw šm lyhwh, "and he worshipped there before Yahweh."

LXX^{AB} omits any such phrase, although 2:11a in LXX^{AB} is very similar: καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου καὶ ἀπηλθὼν εἰς Ἀρραθαίμ.. The reference to appearing before Yahweh is taken as representative of what originally stood in MT in 28b. This is simply because LXX would have every reason to speak of Elkanah and no reason to suppress his name. MT of 28b is considered to be suspicious because Elkanah is thus alluded to for the first time.⁷⁰

Accordingly Budde suggests that in MT Hannah's song was inserted at a point three words later than in LXX^{AB}.

Originally the sequence was: wtnyhhw šm lpny yhwh ("and she brought him before Yahweh"), followed by the Song, and then the concluding words: wtlk hrnth (2:11a, "and she returned to Ramah").⁷¹ A less involved and more acceptable

⁶⁹Driver, Notes, p. 22. See also Klostermann, op. cit., p. 4.

⁷⁰Driver, Notes, pp. 22-23. Wellhausen, Text, p. 26. Interestingly Klostermann reads šm not as an adverb but as a form of šmw'l, who thus becomes the subject of the statement. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 4.

⁷¹Budde, Samuel, p. 17.

emendation and reading is suggested by LXX^L and 4QSam^a. LXX^L reads καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Κυρίῳ in 28b; this is probably attested in 4QSam^a where the verb form is wtšth(w). Cross interprets this as a tqtl form of the third person dual; we may read, "and they worshipped before YHWH."⁷² Thus, MT should be amended to read wyštḥww (cf. Gen. 49:8). With regard to 2:11a, the reading of MT is acceptable, especially since Elkanah has been mentioned heretofore (see above, vv. 24ff).

2:1-36.

1. byhwh. Attested in 4QSam^a. LXX reads ἐν θεῷ μου, to which Cross subscribes,⁷³ as also Driver and Wellhausen.⁷⁴ I see no reason, however, to alter MT especially in light of 4QSam^a. In 1b, LXX omits ky, making the two cola parallel to each other.⁷⁵ However, ky could simply be an emphatic.

2. 4QSam^a reflects a long and conflated version of this verse, retaining phrases exclusive to MT (w'yn swr k'lhynw) and to LXX (καὶ οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν), although the latter is only by reconstruction in 4QSam^a.⁷⁶ The

⁷²Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 20.

⁷³Ibid., p. 20.

⁷⁴Driver, Notes, p. 23. Wellhausen, Text, p. 42.

⁷⁵Driver, Notes, p. 23.

⁷⁶Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 26.

phrase in 2b is considered a gloss by Driver,⁷⁷ partly because it is a poor explanation for 2a and partly because it appears in another form as 2c in LXX (οὐκ ἔστιν ἄγιος πλὴν σοῦ). Smith only adds to the length of the line (already suspiciously long) by amending 2b to agree with LXX: addition of sdyc and alteration of bltk to k'lhynw.⁷⁸ I hesitate to delete 2b in MT entirely, since it appears consistently in our sources in some form. Perhaps deletion of ky would shorten the colon sufficiently and make the phrase more parallel with 2a and 2c. A comparison of 2c in LXX (see above) and in MT leaves one with the clear impression that the latter is the more original. Furthermore it is attested in 4QSam^a.⁷⁹ The image of God as a rock is significant in Hebrew poetry; cf. in Song of Moses - Dt. 32:4, 15, 18, 37; also in Ps. 18:32; Is. 44:8; 30:29.

3a. The second gbhh ("haughtily") is clearly to be deleted; cf. 4QSam^a.

3c. "for YHWH is a god of knowledge; actions are not weighed." (MT) Such a reading is highly unlikely (contra Bostrom).⁸⁰ If Qere is accepted as a correction, wl'

⁷⁷Driver, Notes, p. 24.

⁷⁸Smith, op. cit., p. 15.

⁷⁹Interestingly, LXX^L does not agree with Qumran Samuel at this point but follows the Old Greek.

⁸⁰Otto H. Bostrom, Alternative Readings in the Hebrew of the Books of Samuel (Rock Island, 1918), p. 26.

becomes wlw ("by him..."), which is quite acceptable.⁸¹ I prefer, however, to read w'l tkn ("and a god who weighs..."), following LXX (καὶ θεὸς ἐτοιμάζων ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτοῦ).

4. htym. Driver argues plausibly that this could be plural "by attraction" to gbrym, the real subject in the author's mind (cf. GK 146a).⁸³ 4QSam^a, however, resolves the question in favor of emendation to hth.⁸⁴

5. hdlw 'd. Rather than amend to h^ad^elū 'a**b**ōd ("they shall cease to work"),⁸⁵ the phrase is clear if 'd is read with the next line: "even the barren one shall bear seven-fold." LXX^B merely paraphrases in 5a3: καὶ ἀσθενοῦντες παρῆκαν γῆν. LXX^L takes similar liberties: καὶ οἱ πεινῶντες παρῆκαν γῆν. The second colon of v. 5 is remarkably similar to Jer. 15:9, 'mlh yldt hšb'h.

7. mwryš. The form may be from the root yrš, "to dispossess." Hiphil participle is attested in Deut. 18:12. However, the meaning of "impoverish" or "make poor," that is suggested by the context, is not attested elsewhere for yrš. The form may be from ryš, "be in want" or "poor" (cf. I Sam. 18:23; II Sam. 12:1, 4; Ps. 34:11). The waw occurs by analogy with the preceding mwryd (v. 6).

⁸¹Driver, Notes, p. 25. Wellhausen, Text, p. 43.

⁸²Smith, op. cit., p. 16.

⁸³Driver, Notes, p. 25.

⁸⁴Gross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 20.

⁸⁵Klostermann, op. cit., p. 5.

8. LXX omits 8c and 9a and reads in their place διδοὺς εὐχὴν τῷ εὐχομένῳ καὶ εὐλόγησεν ἔτη δικαίου. Wellhausen argues from this that 8c in MT is superfluous and secondary.⁸⁶ It does, however, provide an appropriate climax and should be retained. Nor is LXX version of 9a convincing, in that it is addressed so explicitly to Hannah. Yahweh is indeed granting more than anyone is asking.⁸⁷

10. The plural form in Qere (mrybyw) is necessary. Probably Yahweh is the subject of 10a and yhtw should be amended to singular, yht.⁸⁸ Such an emendation agrees with LXX (Κύριος ἀσθενῇ ποιήσῃ ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ). In the second colon of 10a, Budde amends 'lw to read 'lywn ("the most high") and re-vocalizes the verb as y^erō'ēm.⁸⁹

Klostermann amends yet another way by reading 'lh ("he ascends"), thus "Yahweh it is who . . . ascends into heaven and thunders."⁹⁰ Another possibility appears most likely to me. In his studies on the Psalms, Mitchell Dahood has identified the consonantal 'ly as a divine name, on the basis of Ugaritic parallels. For example, Ugaritic text 126:III:5-8 reads lars mtr b'l wlšd mtr 'ly

⁸⁶Wellhausen, Text, p. 43.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 44.

⁸⁸Klostermann, op. cit., p. 5. Smith, op. cit., p. 17. Thenius, op. cit., p. 11. Wellhausen, Text, p. 44.

⁸⁹Budde, Books, p. 53.

⁹⁰Klostermann, op. cit., p. 5. Translation my own.

("upon the earth Ba'al rained; upon the field Elī rained").⁹¹ The by-form 'l appears in the Ugaritic name ym'l where 'l is the theophoric element (Ugaritic Text 2106:4). With this in mind, Dahood often re-vocalizes the Masoretic 'ālay when the context suggests that the divine name might be appropriate. For example, in Ps. 7:9 we read šptny yhwh ksdqy wktmy 'ālay. The final word is difficult to render. Dahood re-vocalizes 'ēlī, and an admirable reading is obtained: "Judge me, O Yahweh, according to my righteousness, according to my integrity, O God."⁹² Again in Ps. 41:8, MT reads yhd 'ly ytlhšw kl-šn'y 'ly yhšbw r'h ly. If the second 'ālay is re-vocalized 'ēlī, one can translate "...together they whisper about me. All my enemies, O God, plot evil against me."⁹³ In Ps. 7:9 the poet pairs yhwh and 'ly. An identical phenomenon is produced in 2:10a if 'lw is taken as a corruption of 'ly ('ēlī). The confusion of waw and yodh could easily occur. The bi-cola then read, "Yahweh will shatter his enemies, The Most High will thunder in the heavens." Between the two cola of 10a LXX inserts a lengthy passage which closely parallels that of Jer. 9:22ff. It is difficult to assign priorities, but it may be that this addition appeared in LXX in post-Jeremianic times. The

⁹¹Mitchell Dahood, Psalms I (The Anchor Bible; Garden City, N. Y., 1966), p. 45.

⁹²Ibid., p. 45.

⁹³Ibid., pp. 248-51. Other instances of the form 'ly include Ps. 7:11; 16:6; 32:5.

addition to v. 10 is scarcely to be viewed as part of the original Hebrew text. Klostermann suggests very plausibly that it was first a marginal note, prompted by 9c.⁹⁴

11a. As noted above (1:28b), emendation to conform with LXX^{AB} is not necessary. The mention of Elkanah is to be expected, since his presence is presumed in vv. 24-28.

The fact, however, that LXX of 2:11a equals the combined statements of MT 1:28b and 2:11a is important evidence that Hannah's Song was inserted some time after a text of the narrative was extant.

13. Interpretation of these verses is obscured by the meaning of mšpt (δικαίωμα). It may mean "right" or "due," in which case LXX suggests the correct reading: It uses the preposition *παρὰ* and closely parallels Dt. 18:3; hence, "the right of the priest from the people (is this). . ."⁹⁵ This provides contrast for the description of abuses in v. 15ff. However, mšpt may mean "custom," "practice." This accords well with MT and presumes that the entire passage is narrating priestly abuses. The latter would require no emendation of the text;⁹⁶ furthermore, v. 15 is logically

⁹⁴Klostermann, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁹⁵The wording of Dt. 18:3 is almost identical with our verse: "wzh yhyh mšpt hkhnyh m't h'm..." ("this is the right of the priests from the people...").

⁹⁶Budde views v. 13 as speaking of the right of priests and amends 't to m't in accordance with Syriac and Targum, as well as LXX. Budde, *Books*, p. 53. So also Klostermann, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

the climactic statement, beginning as it does with gm.⁹⁷
kl 'yš zbh zbh wb'. The initial zbh is a ptc. abs.; the
 predicate then begins with wb' (waw consecutive). Cf.
 GK 112⁰⁰ and translate "whenever anyone offered a sacri-
 fice..."

hmzlg šlš - hšnym. Following LXX, words should be re-
 divided: hmzlg šlšh šnym.⁹⁸

14. bw. Amend to lw (LXX εαυτφ). šm. The word is
 superfluous here, but deletion of the original phrase -
lzbh lyhwh (which is read in LXX) - is difficult to explain.

15. There is no need to change the tense of yqtrwn. LXX
 reads λάβε for wyqh, but this change of person seems un-
 necessary for the meaning.

16. MT, 4QSam^a, and LXX all differ in their reading of
 16a. 4QSam^a is an expanded and sometimes more correct
 form of MT: w'nh h'yš w'[m]r 'l n'r hkwhn yqtr hkwhn kywm
h[h]lb. Accordingly, wymr and yqtyrwn should be amended
 to 'mr and yqtr.⁹⁹ LXX presents an elaboration of kywm
 which more clearly connotes the meaning of the passage:
 πρῶτον, ὡς καθεύκει ("first, as is customary...").

16b. As commentators and LXX have recognized, lw should
 be amended to l' - a reading which is attested in 4QSam^a

⁹⁷Wellhausen, Text, pp. 44-45.

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 45.

⁹⁹Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 21.

and in Qere.¹⁰⁰

16b8. Cross rejects both MT and 4QSam^a, which omits the negative and reads wlqthy bhzq. A waw consecutive is required following "suppressed protasis" (cf. I Sam. 6:9).

Thus, his apt reconstruction: w'm l' wlqthy.¹⁰¹

17. h'nšym. Omitted in LXX; it was judged an addition as early as Wellhausen.¹⁰² This judgment is substantiated by 4QSam^a, which likewise omits it.

Prior to verse 17, 4QSam^a (but not LXX^L) has a lengthy insert whose content is obscured by numerous lacunae in the Qumran manuscript. Cross suggests that the addition deals further with the argument of priest versus worshipper. It is very similar to vv. 13-14 and may be a repetition in the context of an argument over the practice recorded earlier (after the manner of Semitic narrative).¹⁰³ Whether it is dittography on the part of the scribe of 4QSam^a or haplography by the scribes of LXX and MT is impossible to determine. Perhaps the greatest significance lies in the vessels mentioned. Fortunately

¹⁰⁰Targum agrees with MT, but cf. Driver, Notes, pp. 31-32; Klosterman, op. cit., p. 6. If Kethib is followed, then ky must be taken as sign of the direct quote: "He said to him, 'Give it now...!'".

¹⁰¹Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 21; contra Driver, Notes, p. 32.

¹⁰²Wellhausen, Text, pp. 45-46.

¹⁰³Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," pp. 21-22.

the vessels mentioned in 4QSam^a are legible (Column II, l. 4): syr and rwr.¹⁰⁴ In LXX, v. 14, three are named: λέβητα (=syr), κύθραν (=rwr), and χαλκίαν. MT mentions four in v. 14. Probably 4QSam^a is the preferable version. Certainly kywr of MT is to be replaced by syr (λέβητα regularly translates syr in LXX).¹⁰⁵

20. y^šm. This is probably to be amended to y^šlm, as in 4QSam^a and LXX (LXX^{AB} - 'Αποτέσαι; LXX^L - 'Ανταποδώσει). 4QSam^a resolves the question of š'1 lyhwh (LXX ἐχρησας τῷ Κυρίῳ). As it stands, the only plausible reading would be as Pu'al: "(the loan) which was lent (to Yahweh)," in which case š'1 is masc. because the author has the boy Samuel in mind.¹⁰⁶ The reading in 4QSam^a is hš'vl(h), i.e., Hiph., 3 f.s., meaning "(the loan which) she lent (to Yahweh)". The same verb appears in 1:28. This fits the context and is the preferred emendation.¹⁰⁷

whlkw lmqmw. This reading is unsatisfactory. It appears to be a combination of wyhlk lmqmw (4QSam^a; LXX - plus h'y^š) and whlkw lmqwmm (Syriac; 12 Hebrew MSS).¹⁰⁸ In this case,

¹⁰⁴Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 26.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁰⁶Wellhausen, Text, p. 46.

¹⁰⁷Budde, Books, p. 54.

¹⁰⁸Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 22.

Syriac should be followed since the context speaks of Elqanah and his wife; furthermore it involves the easier emendation.¹⁰⁹ Amend to lmqwm.

21. Of several variations to MT which 4QSam^a offers in this verse, two are clearly to be accepted: wypqd is the correct form, rather than ky-pqd, since Yahweh's encounter with Hannah is hardly the reason for the action of v. 20.

Kaph and waw are easily confused, as LXX and MT of Is.

39:1b and Jer. 37:16 indicate.¹¹⁰ In the last phrase of v. 21, MT has been influenced by 2:26; much preferable is 4QSam^a: lpny y[hwh]. Strangely, 4QSam^a omits hn'r, which is in LXX^L as well as MT. In addition, the Qumran text and LXX omit wthr, which omission may be correct; and they add 'wd - an addition that is hardly convincing.¹¹¹

22. 4QSam^a adds a phrase concerning Eli's age after m'd (bn ts'ym šnh). This is a reconstruction by Cross, based on 4:15, MT. If this is valid, this suggests haplography in LXX of 4:15.¹¹² In addition, 4QSam^a and LXX omit kl in 22a; for lkl ysr'l, 4QSam^a reads lbny ysr'l and LXX, τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ.. Such variations do not suggest emendation. Of a different order, however, is the omission in

¹⁰⁹Smith, op. cit., p. 19. Contra Wellhausen, Text, p. 46.

¹¹⁰Driver, Notes, p. 33.

¹¹¹Contra Klostermann, op. cit., p. 7.

¹¹²Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," p. 22.

both LXX^B and 4QSam^a of the phrase 't hnšym...mw'd. The phrase may be borrowed from Ex. 38:8 and is of doubtful authenticity.¹¹³ Interestingly, it does appear in LXX^L.

23. 't - dbrykm r'ym. It is unattested except in Alexandrinus (Hexaplaric of I Samuel) and LXX^L, and neither is identical to MT. Unfortunately 4QSam^a is totally obscure here; Cross conjectures that dbrym r'ym fits exactly the lacuna.¹¹⁴ However, the vast majority of MSS and LXX^B omit it. It is probably a corruption to be deleted.

Driver conjectures that the phrase may have been a marginal gloss, elaborating on kdbrym h'lh.¹¹⁵ The final word of the verse is probably to be deleted as dittography (vis a vis 'l in next verse). Once again 4QSam^a has only a lacuna. Old Greek reads τοῦ λαοῦ κυρίου, which is followed in LXX^L. This prompted Wellhausen to note that Yahweh was originally intended; it was changed to 'lhym as was customary; from that 'lh developed.¹¹⁶ This argument is too involved to be convincing, whereas the basis of scribal dittography is clearly present.

24. As Driver has noted concerning v. 24b, "the integrity

¹¹³Budde, Books, p. 54. Driver, Notes, p. 33. Wellhausen, Text, p. 46.

¹¹⁴Cross, "A New Biblical Fragment," pp. 22-23.

¹¹⁵Driver, Notes, p. 34.

¹¹⁶Wellhausen, Text, pp. 46-7.

of the text is reasonably open to suspicion."¹¹⁷ The phrase 'šr 'nky šm' is an apparent repetition from v. 23. More disturbing is the phrase m'brym 'm - yhwh. Targum inserts 'tm, reading "you cause the people of Yahweh to transgress." LXX seems to have read something entirely different when they translated τοῦ μὴ δουλεύειν λαῶν θεῷ i.e., "(the report) of the people's not serving God." The alteration of m'brym to m'bdym is, of course, easily understood, but LXX has introduced a negative and reads θεῷ not θεοῦ. Of those commentators who attempt a solution, Klostermann amends the most radically. He deletes 23b (after šm') as well as the repetitious portion of v. 24 (l'....šm'). In 24b, he inserts 'tm before m'brym, and with LXX he dissolves the construct 'm - yhwh. Hence, v. 24 reads: "no, my sons, you are driving the people from God."¹¹⁸ Thenius inserts 'tm in 24b and translates m'brym as "oppress," "burden" - a rare meaning found in Is. 43:23, 24.¹¹⁹ Perhaps the best solution is to assume that the variants in LXX and Targum are merely exegetical attempts to resolve an obscure passage and read with MT: "... (the report which I hear) the people of Yahweh spreading."¹²⁰ This requires no

¹¹⁷Driver, Notes, p. 35.

¹¹⁸Klostermann, op. cit., p. 8.

¹¹⁹Thenius, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

¹²⁰Driver, Notes, p. 35. Wellhausen, Text, p. 47.

emendations but does rest on an unattested use for 'br: always it is followed by reference to that "in" or "through" which something spread.¹²¹

25a. The meaning of this passage is obscure, partially because LXX seemingly re-interpreted it: ἐὰν ἀμαρτάνων ἀμάρτη ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἄνθρωπον, καὶ προσεύξονται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Κύριον. καὶ ἐὰν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀμάρτη, τίς προσεύξεται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. This ignores not only the change of tenses of Hebrew pll (in first instance, "to mediate, arbitrate"; secondly, "to intercede"), but also omits 'lhym as subject of first clause. LXX version is suspicious mainly because it lacks meaning: One could still pray to God regardless of the nature of the sin.¹²² Driver¹²³ and Wellhausen¹²⁴ interpret MT to mean that God can be mediator and judge in cases between man and man, but he cannot serve as a court of appeal when he himself is the plaintiff. Wellhausen identifies a further nuance by seeing the 'lhym as Yahweh's representatives, i.e., the priests (cf. Ex. 22:8b). Thus, when a priest sins against God (and here, of course, the sons of Eli are in mind), he is exposed to God's direct

¹²¹Driver, Notes, p. 35.

¹²²Wellhausen, Text, p. 47.

¹²³Driver, Notes, p. 35.

¹²⁴Wellhausen, Text, pp. 47-48.

wrath.¹²⁵ It is also possible that the verse is lamenting that Eli's sons have disqualified themselves as priests; now, who is there that can intercede before God when someone commits a religious misdemeanor? pllw could either be taken as 3 m.s. with a suffix having dative force ("for him") or amended to 3 m.pl. with additions of lw.¹²⁶ Probably the latter is preferable.

27. hnglh. As it stands, the hē denotes a question. This is expressive of Yahweh's anger and surprise ("Did I not reveal myself...") as Driver¹²⁷ and Wellhausen¹²⁸ have noted. However, such a reading either presumes a negative answer (which cannot be) or requires the addition of l' to the verse. LXX and Targum are more correct in reading a simple, declarative statement. Presumably the hē results from dittography following yhwh.¹²⁹ 'bdym should be added after bmsrym, following LXX and Targum. As it stands, bmsrym lbyt is "unnatural." Note Deut.:6:21 which contains the (amended) expression.¹³⁰

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 48.

¹²⁶Driver, Notes, p. 35.

¹²⁷Ibid., p. 36.

¹²⁸Wellhausen, Text, p. 48.

¹²⁹Smith, op. cit., p. 24.

¹³⁰Driver, Notes, p. 36.

28. wbhr. This need not be amended, contra Smith¹³¹ Inf. abs. is used after an inflected verb (cf. GK 113²).

l^ekōhēn needs to be re-vocalized to l^ekahēn (cf. LXX ἱερατεύειν), especially since the author is speaking of a family, not an individual.¹³² "I chose it...to act as priest,..." (LXX ἐξελεξάμην τὸν οἶκον ...). lpny in MT seems quite natural, although it is omitted in LXX^B and Itala. LXX adds the infelicitous εἰς βρωσιν at end of verse.

29. As the verse stands in MT, m'wn cannot be correct; perhaps it should read bm'ny, "in my dwelling" (cf. Driver).¹³³ LXX, however, presents a different reading. The Hebrew Vorlage of LXX must have read tbyt for tb'tw and m'wyn for m'wn, while deleting 'šr swty. This improves the meaning considerably; the corruption of m'wyn especially is easy to imagine (addition of a yodh). Smith suggests that 'šr swty was added to make m'wn intelligible. lhbry'km need not be amended. l'my is incorrect, requiring either deletion of lamedh as dittography (cf. Targum) or emendation to lpny (LXX ἔμποσθέν μου). Perhaps the latter is preferable since both MT and LXX

¹³¹Smith, op. cit., p. 24.

¹³²Driver, Notes, pp. 36-37.

¹³³Ibid., pp. 37-38.

witness to lamedh.¹³⁴

30. yēqāllu (Qal) should be re-vocalized, yiqqāllū (Niphal), cf. Is. 30:16.

31b-32a. This passage (mhywt zqn... 't ysr' l) is not contained in LXX^B. LXX^L omits 31b but includes 32a, in a literal (and obscure) reading of MT. Deletion of the passage from MT is suggested, especially since mhywt zqn bbytk is repeated in 32b, and translation of 32a is conjectural.¹³⁵ Of greatest difficulty is the phrase sr

m'wn. m'wn seems to refer to Yahweh's "place" or temple, yet Eli did not live to see Shiloh's fall.¹³⁶ Smith (cf. also RSV) amends m'wn to m'wyn and hesitantly suggests, "thou shalt look, being in straits and with envious eyes ..."¹³⁷ Driver finds it necessary to amend yytyb to

'ytyb or to supply a subject.¹³⁸ The form can be intransitive as in 20:13, ky - yytb 'l - 'by, however.

33. The verse refers to Abiathar, who escaped massacre (I Sam. 22); 'ynyk and npšk need be amended to 'ynyw and npšw ("his eyes...his being") as in LXX.¹³⁹ Driver amends

¹³⁴Wellhausen, Text, p. 48.

¹³⁵Ibid., pp. 48-49.

¹³⁶Driver, Notes, pp. 38-39.

¹³⁷Smith, op. cit., pp. 23-4.

¹³⁸Driver, Notes, p. 39.

¹³⁹Ibid., pp. 39-40. Wellhausen, Text, p. 51.

l'dyb to the regular Hiphil form (lhdyb).¹⁴⁰ However, Aphel form is not unknown, cf. 'šky^m for hškm in Jer. 25:3. Clearly MT has omitted the necessary bhrb, "by the sword"; cf. LXX ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ.

On the meaning of vv. 31-35, Driver and Wellhausen agree that the disaster referred to is a permanent one beyond Eli's time; hence, 32a must be incorrect. If one does not argue this way, then v. 31 refers to the Philistine victory, but the sign of v. 34 is the same as the disaster! In their view, v. 31 alludes to the massacre of the priests at Nob. Abiathar is the sole survivor (v. 33), and the death of Eli's sons is the sign (v. 34). Verse 35 refers to Zadok. Wellhausen deletes 31b-32a;¹⁴¹ Driver wants to replace v. 32a with something about the fate of Eli's family after Nob.¹⁴² This interpretation, with deletion of vv. 31b-32a, appears sound to me.

3:1-21.

1. nprš. This is sole instance of niphal. Also the probability of dittography due to the preceding nun suggests emendation to prš (Qal - either active or passive participle).¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰Driver, Notes, p. 39.

¹⁴¹Wellhausen, Text, pp. 48-51.

¹⁴²Driver, Notes, pp. 38-40.

¹⁴³Budde, Books, p. 55. Wellhausen, Text, p. 51.

2. 'ynw. The reading of Qere, 'ynyw, is certainly expected. kēhōt is a fem. pl. adjective of the root kh, "to be dim" or "faint" (cf. Lev. 13:39 where it also appears). The inf. k^ohōt is more likely following the verb hll (cf. Dt. 2:25, 31).¹⁴⁴ In later Hebrew a participle regularly follows hll. Because of this, the Masoretes may have vocalized accordingly, especially in absence of lamedh prefix.
3. trm ykbh. Imperfect tense usually follows trm.¹⁴⁵ No reason suggests itself for deleting ywh as LXX^B does. The phrase hykl ywh occurs often, as in 1:9. LXX^L adds καὶ κατέσκη to the end of the verse.
4. 'l - šmw'l. Amend to double vocative, cf. v. 10 ("he called as before..."). Samuel's response in 4b presumes that Yahweh mentioned his name.¹⁴⁶
6. wyqm. This is deleted in LXX, leaving the double vocative, as would be expected. It is probably inserted because of sequence in v. 8.
7. yāda'. This should be vocalized as imperfect yēda', following trm.¹⁴⁷
10. šmw'l šmw'l. Klostermann deletes as unnecessary

¹⁴⁴Driver, Notes, p. 42.

¹⁴⁵Driver, Tenses, p. 32.

¹⁴⁶Klostermann, op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁴⁷Driver, Notes, pp. 42-43.

following "as before."¹⁴⁸ I would follow MT and LXX^L in this instance.

12. 'l - 'ly. MT is inconsistent in the use of 'l; cf. 1:10. Here the translations are surely correct in interpreting as 'l (LXX ἐπὶ; Targum, 'l). hhl wkllh, "from beginning to end." Inf. absolute is used in adverbial sense, GK 113^h.

13. lw. Clearly not to be amended; YHWH describes his judgment upon Eli. Klostermann feels impelled to amend hgdty to the second person. He argues that v. 15 refers to Samuel's fear over not having told Eli. Masoretes presumably amended the verb in v. 13 to exonerate Samuel.¹⁴⁹ It is more likely, however, that Samuel was fearful because of such a visionary experience. b'wn. The word is superfluous and suspicious in the construct state (although cf. GK 130^c). Hence, we should delete the word as an intrusion from a text related to LXX, which read b'wn bnyw.¹⁵⁰ In this reading, 'šr - yd' (likewise omitted in LXX^B) is to be deleted.¹⁵¹ lhm is a case of tiqqūnē sopherim; LXX^B

¹⁴⁸Klostermann, op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁵⁰Budde, Books, p. 55. Wellhausen, Text, p. 53.

¹⁵¹Smith, op. cit., p. 29.

attests to the original l'lhym.¹⁵²

14. LXX^B reads οὐδ' οὐτως for wlkn, as if a contraction of l' - kn. It is attached at the end of v. 13. nšb'ty... 'm. 'm following the verb "to swear" has a negative meaning: "I swear...the sin of the house of Eli will not be atoned ..."¹⁵³

15. All commentators¹⁵⁴ insert wyškm bbqr ("when he arose in the morning"), after hbqr. Although attested in LXX^B it seems redundant. MT is superior.

16. 't - šmw'l. This should read 'l - šmw'l.¹⁵⁵

18. LXX^L adds dbr following mmmnw, which is necessary ("he did not hide a word from him...").¹⁵⁶

b'ynw. Exact parallels of this idiom (1:23; 14:36, 40; II Sam. 19:28) suggest the Qere reading, b'ynyw.

20b-4:1a. The text is an excellent example of the acute problems encountered in the Books of Samuel. It is disconnected in thought and differs markedly with LXX, which alters 4:1a entirely and includes a long passage at the close of v. 21. The first sentence of this addition follows too closely v. 20 to be authentic: καὶ ἐπιστεύθη

¹⁵²Klostermann, op. cit., p. 12. Smith, op. cit., p. 29.

¹⁵³Driver, Notes, p. 44.

¹⁵⁴Driver, Notes, p. 44. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 12. Smith, op. cit., p. 29. Thenius, op. cit., p. 17. Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 53.

¹⁵⁵Driver, Notes, p. 44.

¹⁵⁶Smith, op. cit., p. 29.

Σαμουὴλ προφήτης γενέσθαι τῷ κυρίῳ εἰς πάντα 'Ισραὴλ ἀπ' ἄκρων τῆς γῆς καὶ ἕως ἄκρων. However, the remainder is apt, concerned as the author is to contrast Samuel with the house of Eli. The addition to MT should be w'ly zqn m'd wbnw hlkw hlwk whr' drkm lpony yhwh. This replaces the last three words of v. 21, which are either redundant (bšlw) or lacking in meaning (bdb'r yhwh).¹⁵⁷ An editor may have interjected the abrupt phrase bdb'r yhwh into the text in order to avoid the impression that the "word of Samuel" (4:1a MT) was the agent of revelation.¹⁵⁸

Continuing the narrative, it seems clear that 4:1a continues the theme of chap. 3.¹⁵⁹ Just as Yahweh revealed himself to Samuel, not the Elides, so the "word" is faithfully brought to the people. A new chapter commences then, and LXX inserts a general introduction: καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ συναθροίζονται ἄλλόφυλοι εἰς πόλεμον ἐπὶ 'Ισραὴλ. This follows directly on the addition adopted above. It provides a plausible reason for the events of 4:1b and is attested consistently in LXX. Thus, the following addition should be made to MT prior to 4:1b: wyhy bymym hhm wyqbsw plštyl lmlhmlh 'l yšr'l.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷Budde, Books, p. 55.

¹⁵⁸Oskar Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament (Giessen, 1934), p. 64, f.n. 3.

¹⁵⁹Driver, Notes, p. 45.

¹⁶⁰Driver, Notes, p. 45. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 13.

Mention should be made of the variety of solutions proposed by scholars apropos of these verses. Budde retains the LXX supplement of v. 21 (produced above) in lieu of v. 20, which he thinks (mistakenly) is lacking from LXX. He deletes the last three words of v. 21 and retains the second sentence of LXX supplement. Finally, 4:1a is to be replaced by LXX reading at that point.¹⁶¹ As often, Klostermann's emendations are more artful than convincing. He retains MT of v. 21, translating bdb ywh as "for the sake of the word of YHWH." 4:1a of MT is retained, followed by the LXX addition to this verse. Then follows the account in MT except that lqr't plstym is amended to lqr'tm ("to oppose them"), since Philistines have been mentioned.¹⁶² Smith deletes the final words of v. 21 but also changes ywh to ysr'l as subject of 21a, because 21a and b appear repetitious to him. He accepts the second sentence of LXX addition at end of v. 21. For v. 1a of chap. 4, he accepts LXX version.¹⁶³

7:1-17.

1. Perhaps 'sr should follow 'byndb.¹⁶⁴
2. wyhyw 'srym shh. This appears as an addition, since it repeats the phrase immediately preceding. Smith finds

¹⁶¹Budde, Books, p. 55.

¹⁶²Klostermann, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

¹⁶³Smith, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

¹⁶⁴Driver, Notes, p. 60.

it necessary to delete all of wyrbw...šnh as a late addition; thus, he translates, "from the day the Ark dwelt at Kirjath Jearim all the house of Israel turned after Yahweh."¹⁶⁵ Yet it seems just as likely that the author is describing the length of stay of the ark.

wynhw. This means "they mourned" after Yahweh (cf. Micah 2:4; Ezekiel 32:18). However, the versions depart considerably from such a reading. Targum has w'tnhy'w (Ithpe. nhy, "they gathered together"). LXX^B reads ἐπέβλεψεν, "looked toward." LXX^L reads ἐπέστρεψε, "turn aside." Wellhausen amends to wypnh, apparently following LXX^L.¹⁶⁶ On the other hand, Klostermann amends to wytw ("they inclined toward"), on the basis that Targum reading is a corruption of w'ytpy'w (root pny, "to turn").¹⁶⁷ The unique reading in MT (the only instance of nhh in Niphal) is at once the best argument for its authenticity and the probable reason for such varied witnesses among the versions. LXX^L adds ἐν εἰρήνῃ, i.e., "at Shiloh," to the end of v. 2. While perhaps not originally in MT, it is no doubt a correct interpolation, reflecting the importance of this cult center under Samuel (cf. 3:21).

Thenius argues that a portion of the narrative has fallen out, prior to v. 3. He finds the reference to the

¹⁶⁵Smith, op. cit., p. 51.

¹⁶⁶Wellhausen, Notes, p. 67.

¹⁶⁷Klostermann, op. cit., p. 22.

people's apostasy and to Samuel's role as judge in v. 3 much too abrupt and lacking in appropriate introduction. As it stands v. 3 raises the question of deliverance from the Philistines even though they have brought back the ark. There has been no preparation for such a contingency.¹⁶⁸ However, this is all very conjectural, and no evidence exists in MT or any of the versions for such a lacuna. As Wellhausen notes, we should expect the prominent role which Samuel assumes, after the events of chap. 3 (cf. especially v. 21). Furthermore, the mere return of the ark would not resolve the political situation between the two peoples, as Thenius seems to expect.¹⁶⁹ It is significant that the observations of Thenius and Wellhausen suggest the theory that 7:3-17 originally followed 3:21 directly.¹⁷⁰ Wellhausen does appear to favor the deletion of v. 3, on the grounds of its Deuteronomic cast and its repetition of a theme already made explicit. Israel's fidelity to Yahweh is the necessary condition for deliverance from the Philistines. However, the event described in v. 3 is a necessary prelude to the remainder of the chapter, especially the rite of penitence in vv. 4-6.

6. The addition of 'rsh, "on the ground" after lpny yhwh

¹⁶⁸Thenius, op. cit., p. 28.

¹⁶⁹Wellhausen, Text, p. 67.

¹⁷⁰See below, pp. 138-39.

is found in LXX but is hardly convincing. Driver suggests that LXX may be correct: an indication that the act was not cultic but a symbol of purification.¹⁷¹ Certainly it is the latter, but just so, it is doubtless cultic--as the context strongly suggests.

sm. This is lacking in LXX; however, that is hardly cause for deletion. Nothing can be indicated from such a witness, contra Smith.¹⁷²

8. 'l - thrš mmnw mz'q 'l-yhwh. "Do not be silent from us, so as not to cry to YHWH..." For uses of mn here, cf. GK 119.¹⁷³ Several MSS of LXX add to this verse, καὶ εἶπεν Σαμουὴλ μὴ μοι γενοῖτο ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ κυρίου θεοῦ μου τοῦ μὴ βοᾶν περὶ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενον ("and Samuel said, 'It shall not be to me to fall away from YHWH, my God, by not raising a cry for you.") The addition is suspect since it fails to appear in any of the main texts of LXX and also because it is a duplicate of I Sam. 12:23.

9. klyl. The term, meaning "whole" or "whole offering" (Dt. 33:10; Ps. 51:21; Lv. 6:15), is ignored in LXX, which reads σὺν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ. Here it stands in apposition to 'wlh.

11. lbyt kr. "to Beth Kar." Attested in LXX, this village is, however, not mentioned elsewhere in MT. Targum reads

¹⁷¹Driver, Notes, p. 64.

¹⁷²Smith, op. cit., p. 53.

¹⁷³Driver, Notes, p. 64.

byt srwn. Klostermann suggests that byt hrn (Beth Horon) may have been intended.¹⁷⁴ The uniqueness of the reading suggests its probability.

12. hšn. A proper name is expected here, parallel to "Mizpah." Hence, Thenius' suggestion is not convincing that merely a prominent rock is mentioned as a landmark.¹⁷⁵ LXX reads τῆς παλαιᾶς and probably the village of hyśnh is intended (cf. 2 Chr. 13:19).¹⁷⁶

'd - hnh. Wellhausen and Budde amend to 'ēdāh t^ohī kī.¹⁷⁷ However, LXX attests MT, and no emendation is warranted.

14. m'qrwn. LXX^B reads "Ashkelon" in accord with its reading of 5:10. LXX^L confirms LXX^B. LXX^B further replaces gt with 'Αγάβ, which Wellhausen takes as an (oblique) allusion to the reference to Gaza in Zeph. 2:4 - 'azāh 'azūbāh tihveh!¹⁷⁸
w't - gbwlh hsyh yār'l myd plštyh. Thenius views this as an "idle addition."¹⁷⁹ However, it is attested in the versions and was perhaps intended as a summary statement to the claims of Israel's complete victory.

¹⁷⁴Klostermann, op. cit., p. 23

¹⁷⁵Thenius, op. cit., p. 30.

¹⁷⁶Driver, Notes, p. 65. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 23. Wellhausen, Text, p. 58.

¹⁷⁷Budde, Books, p. 58. Wellhausen, Text, p. 48.

¹⁷⁸Wellhausen, Text, p. 68.

¹⁷⁹Thenius, op. cit., p. 30.

16. 't. This may mean "near" as in geographical phrases, 'šr 't (Jud. 3:19; 4:11). However, the most natural reading is emendation to 'l.

hmqwmwt. LXX reads ἁγιασμένους ("sanctified places").

Wellhausen suggests that mqm is here an Arabic loan word meaning a holy place.¹⁸⁰ However, it is more likely that LXX is here simply adding an interpretative connotation.

8:1-22.

2. Contrary to this verse, Josephus (Antiquities VI. 3, 2) locates Samuel's sons at two different places - Bethel and Beersheba. Klostermann suggests that Josephus represents a tradition which altered the original account to a more conventional reading. Probably Samuel, in his old age, needed "trusted" representatives in the southern village of Beersheba.¹⁸¹

3. bdrkw. The singular, rather than the plural of Qere, seems most natural: b^edarkō. Qere regularly suggests the plural (yw), as in 3:2; 10:21.

4. zqny. This is amended to ἄνδρες in LXX. The more precise statement by MT is to be preferred.

8. 'šr - 'šw. Probably ly should be added to this phrase, as suggested from LXX (ἀ ἐποίησάν μοι).¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰Wellhausen, Text, p. 69.

¹⁸¹Klostermann, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

¹⁸²Klostermann, op. cit., p. 25. Smith, op. cit., p. 57. Thenius, op. cit., p. 32. Wellhausen, Text, p. 69.

9. 'k ky. Here translate as "except that" (cf. 'ps ky).

This is the only instance of such a rendering; but it is suggested by $\pi\lambda\eta\nu \ddot{o}\tau\iota$ in LXX.¹⁸³

h'd t'yd bhm. In the sense of "witness against" or "warn"; cf. Gen. 43:3, Ex. 19:23.¹⁸⁴

12. šry 'lpym...hmšym. The versions differ, although all attest to "1000s." LXX reads m'wt ("hundreds") for hmšym. Syriac, in a surely prolix manner, reads, "Commanders of 1000s and 100s and 50s and 10s." Targum agrees with MT. It is impossible to decide whether LXX or MT is the more authentic, although the reference to a unit of only 50 is unusual enough to be authentic.

15. y'šr. Driver amends to Piel (cf. Deut. 14:22, "give a tithe"): y°'ašer. However, the meaning is to "take a tenth." Hence, perhaps Hiphil (ya'šir).

16. bhwrykm. LXX reads $\tau\acute{\alpha} \beta\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{o}\lambda\iota\alpha \ddot{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$, "your cattle." Hence, numerous scholars amend to bqrkm ("your cattle"; a collective noun).¹⁸⁵ They argue that reference to young men is repetitious of vv. 11, 12 and (Klostermann) that the parallel of Deut. 5:14 suggests emendation: servants and cattle belong to the household. However, it seems inappropriate to interject animals at a point where MT is

¹⁸³Driver, Notes, p. 67.

¹⁸⁴Ibid.

¹⁸⁵Driver, Notes, p. 68. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 26. Smith, op. cit., p. 58.

listing the "best things" of various groups of people:

"your servants, your maids, and your young men." Furthermore, the reference to young men here does not duplicate that in vv. 11-12, since in the latter the author is speaking of military conscription whereas here it is the produce of the people which is commandeered.

w'sh. LXX reads ἀποδεκατώσει, "you will tithe." This seems less suited to the context than MT reading, however.

17. y'sr. See above, v. 15.

18. LXX adds ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐξελέξασθε ἑαυτοῖς βασιλέα to the end of the verse. The prosaic aptness of this addition¹⁸⁶ suggests that it comes from an editor's pen.

19. wy'mrw l'. Some Hebrew MSS have lw for l',¹⁸⁷ while LXX reads both: αὐτῷ οὐχί, ἀλλ'. Haplography would explain MT. I would amend by adding lw (cf. parallel expression in 12:12), contra Wellhausen.¹⁸⁸

10:17-26.

18. msrym. LXX^B reads pl'stym instead, but LXX^L translates the Hebrew text with παραὼ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου, which would appear to be an expansion of a text identical with MT since it retains msrym. This witness, as well as the formalized

¹⁸⁶Klostermann, op. cit., p. 26. Smith, op. cit., p. 58. Thenius, op. cit., p. 32.

¹⁸⁷R. Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, p. 416.

¹⁸⁸Wellhausen, Text, p. 70.

style of the passage (cf. Jud. 6:9a for an exact parallel), suggest that MT is preferred.

19. lw. The witness against this reading is considerable: Syriac, Vulgate, LXX, and 35 Hebrew MSS. Furthermore l' ky occurs in much the same phrase in 8:18 and 12:12. Emendation to l' is required.

21. hmtry. This clan is nowhere else attested. Confusion exists in LXX where the term is interchanged with bkry.

Although LXX reads Ματταρει here, in 9:1 bkwr is rendered as Βαχει,, which seems to be a combination of the two terms. The family of bkr is attested in Saul's genealogy (9:1) as in that of Seba', who was also an 'ys ymyny (II Sam. 20:1). Therefore, I would amend to read hbky.

Immediately following this, LXX reads καὶ προσάγουσιν τὴν φυλὴν Ματταρεὶ εἰς ἄνδρας. This restores the literary pattern of repetition. The process involves first assembly (qrb) and then selection (lkd). The omission may have occurred because of homoiarkton (wyqrb and wylkd). I would restore wyqrb 't - mšpht hbky lgbrym.¹⁸⁹

25. mšpt hmlkh. This phrase occurs only three times; here and in 8:9, 11. It may be assumed that a corpus of laws is referred to, as in Jos. 24:25 (hq wmspt). However, the word in the construct with the meaning of laws for a particular official occurs nowhere else. mšpt in the construct occurs fifty times. Most often it refers to a particular

¹⁸⁹Wellhausen, Text, p. 75.

law, e.g., the law applying to both sojourner and native (Lev. 24:22; Deut. 27:19). It may be used in the larger sense of "justice" (Ex. 23:6; 28:30; Deut. 10:18; 16:18; 24:17). Deut. 17:16-18 is most often cited as dealing with the same corpus of law for the king to which this passage alludes.¹⁹⁰ The term which is used in Deut. 17:16-18, however, is *twrh* (v. 18). Since no parallels exist, it should not be assumed that the term refers to a particular body of laws to which the king is subject.

12:1-25.

1. The formal parallels between this verse and 8:7, 22 are close and suggest a common author:

8:7. wy'mr yhwh 'l-šmw'l šm' bql h'm lkl 'šr-y'mrw
'lyk.

8: 22. wy'mr yhwh 'l-šmw'l šm' bqlm.

12:1. wy'mr šmw'l 'l-kl-yšr'l hnh šm'ty bqlkm lkl
'šr-'mrtm ly.

2. Budde deletes the portion of this verse from w'ny zqnty to 'tkm. He finds the reference to Samuel's sons unconvincing since their practices are corrupt (8:3). Furthermore, to speak of Samuel's age points to a natural reason for him to step down. Rather the intent of the author is to contrast the demand for a king with Samuel's

¹⁹⁰Hertzberg, I & II Samuel, pp. 89-90.

retirement as the people's faithful leader.¹⁹¹ Other scholars have not followed this suggestion, however. I feel that Budde demands too much of this particular verse. The issue at hand is not the contrast between Samuel and Saul but rather Samuel's own conduct of his office. Furthermore, the matter of Samuel's age is relevant, for this is the background of the need for a king in the anti-monarchical source (cf. 8:5).

3. w'lym 'yny bw. Most commentators follow LXX^B which reads καὶ ὑπόδημα. ἀποκρίθητε κατ' ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀποδώσω ὑμῖν ("and (even) sandals. Answer me and I will return to you.") Hence in Hebrew: wn'lym 'nw by.¹⁹² Driver merely adds 'nw by as a suitable preceding phrase for w'syb lkm.¹⁹³ It is noteworthy, however, that LXX^L as well as Luc. preserve both the phrase "to blind my eyes with it" as well as what has apparently been omitted from MT. Thus, the text would read kpr wn'lym w'lym 'yny bw. 'nw by w'syb lkm ("a bribe or sandals, to blind my eyes with it. Answer me and I will restore to you.") I would accept such a reading as likely, due to the importance of LXX^L and because haplography is explained by the similarity

¹⁹¹Budde, Samuel, pp. 77-78.

¹⁹²Klostermann, op. cit., p. 27. Thenius, op. cit., p. 46. Wellhausen, Text, pp. 77-78.

¹⁹³Driver, Notes, p. 89.

of terms, w'lym and n'lym; 'yny bw and 'nw by.

The connection of sandals with a bribe has bothered most scholars. E. A. Speiser has offered an interpretation of the text on the basis of two Nuzi texts that indicate the role of the sandal as a legal symbol.¹⁹⁴ In the one a man presents his daughter, rather than his son, with an inheritance of land, for which the daughter offers "one pair of sandals, one garment, one sheep, one sow with her ten pigs." The animals are of economic value, but the sandals and garment remain unexplained. The second document tells that a bridegroom repays his father-in-law with a "cloak and a pair of sandals" for the gift of the latter's daughter in marriage. The case involves a lawsuit. Both incidents appear to be special transactions outside the normal provisions of the law. Speiser contends that the ceremonial payment of sandals validates the action and protects the parties from an accusation of illegal activity.¹⁹⁵ Therefore, Samuel is claiming that he neither took a bribe nor even engaged in special cases where the law could be fulfilled by a token payment of a sandal.¹⁹⁶

It is warranted to conclude from the evidence that

¹⁹⁴E. A. Speiser, "Of Shoes and Shekels," BASOR 77 (February, 1940), pp. 15-20.

¹⁹⁵Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁹⁶Ibid., p. 18.

a sandal was a symbol in business transactions. This is also indicated from Ruth 4:7, which Speiser cites. In reference to Boaz' act of removing his sandal, the author notes, ". . . to confirm a transaction, the one drew off his sandal and gave it to the other, and this was the manner of attesting in Israel." However, it is not entirely clear from the Nuzi documents that the sandal was used in unusual or extra-legal practices. And the clear implication of Ruth 4:7 is that payment of a sandal was a normal and entirely proper way of concluding a transaction. Samuel would have no reason to avoid such a practice. While further evidence from the Ancient Near East may bolster Speiser's argument, I would suggest for the moment that Samuel simply means that he has taken neither a bribe nor even something as harmless as a gift of sandals.

5. wy'mr 'd. Masoretic pointing renders the phrase, "And they said, 'He is witness.'" The orthography is defective, in the omission of final vowel letter. LXX^{BA}, Syriac, Vulgate, Targum all read the plural, as is required by the sense of the passage. LXX^L and Luc. achieve the same meaning but read εἶπεν ὁ λαὸς, however. Although these latter witnesses are important, nevertheless the loss of h'm is difficult to explain. Probably LXX^L and Luc. sought to retain an apparently singular verb while also preserving the passage's meaning.

6. In order to make sense of the passage, 'd ("witness") should be added before yhwh: "Yahweh is witness, who..." This is attested in LXX. The haplography possibly occurred because of ayin in both 'd and h'm immediately preceding.¹⁹⁷ Klostermann quite unconvincingly takes 'd, the last word of v. 5, as originally part of the phrase yhwh 'šr... in v. 6.¹⁹⁸
7. Following lpony yhwh, LXX reads καὶ ἀπαγγελεῖ ὑμῖν ("I will tell to you..."). This reads more fully than MT where w'gydh lkm apparently was omitted.¹⁹⁹
8. After msrym, LXX adds καὶ ἐταπαίνωσεν αὐτοὺς Αἴγυπτος ("and Egypt oppressed them"). Klostermann rejects this as an unwarranted elaboration.²⁰⁰ Driver adds wy'nwm msrym to MT after msrym.²⁰¹ The haplography may have occurred when a copyist's eye skipped from first msrym to the second. Thenius²⁰² and Wellhausen²⁰³ presume that the verb kn' was used instead of 'nh.

¹⁹⁷Driver, Notes, p. 92. Thenius, op. cit., p. 47. Wellhausen, Text, p. 78.

¹⁹⁸Klostermann, op. cit., p. 37.

¹⁹⁹Driver, Notes, p. 93.

²⁰⁰Klostermann, op. cit., p. 38.

²⁰¹Driver, Notes, p. 93.

²⁰²Thenius, op. cit., p. 47.

²⁰³Wellhausen, Text, p. 78.

LXX manuscripts consistently attest wbnyw ("and his sons") after y'qb. It is difficult to reject this reading, although it adds little to the meaning of the passage.

wyšbwm, "they caused them to dwell." This could hardly be done by Moses and Aaron. LXX suggests the correct reading when it translates κτέμισεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ. Hence, we should read wyšybm ("he caused them to dwell ...").²⁰⁴

11. The versions provide no consistent witness to MT with regard to the judges listed here. Targum reads šmw'n for the unusual bdn. Apparently they viewed the latter as synonymous with bn-dn ("a Danite").²⁰⁵ They retain šmw'l after yph. On the other hand LXX^L and Syriac read brq (Barak) for bdn and "Samson" in place of "Samuel." LXX^B follows MT in reading "Samuel." The emendation to brq seems appropriate. Such an oblique reference to Samson as bn-dn is inconsistent with this list of names. The reference to Samuel (w't-šmw'l) does not seem convincing, however. Samuel is presenting a list of past judges, through whom Yahweh delivered his people. It is not until v. 12 that the present situation is introduced. Those who argue for MT here²⁰⁶ must conclude that someone other than

²⁰⁴Driver, Notes, p. 93. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 38.

²⁰⁵Wellhausen, Text, p. 78.

²⁰⁶Driver, p. 94. Smith, p. 87.

Samuel is responsible for the inclusion of the prophet's name. Samuel probably would not refer to himself (contra Wellhausen).²⁰⁷ However, this recital of Israel's judges does not appear as an editor's expansion. It is essential to Samuel's argument against the kingship. It seems more probable that LXX^L and Syriac suggest the original text (šmšwn), and MT reflects a later editor's enthusiasm for Samuel.

13. 'šr š'ltm. LXX^B omits this phrase. Nevertheless, the pun on the name of Israel's king is attested in LXX^L and Luc. and should probably be retained, contrary to the opinion of most commentators.²⁰⁸ Thenius suggests that the phrase was originally a marginal note which unfortunately entered the text. This is a plausible argument, but the textual evidence suggests that it must have entered the text at an early date.

14. The verse lacks an apodosis for its conditional clause. LXX provides divided witness: LXX^B follows MT exactly except for omission of 'lhykm. LXX^L and Luc. on the other hand preserve (or add!) an apodosis: καὶ ἐξελεῖται ὑμᾶς. On this basis, Klostermann²⁰⁹ and Thenius²¹⁰ amend

²⁰⁷Wellhausen, Text, p. 78.

²⁰⁸Driver, Notes, p. 94. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 38. Thenius, op. cit., pp. 47-48. Wellhausen, Text, p. 79.

²⁰⁹Klostermann, p. 38.

²¹⁰Thenius, op. cit., p. 48.

'lhykm to wysylkm. Driver is content to retain MT in this regard. He also criticizes any emendation of whytm... 'hr since it also appears in Ex. 23:2, II Sam. 2:10, I Kgs. 12:20; 16:21 in the sense of to "follow after," or "support."²¹¹ While no emendation of protasis appears necessary, I would follow Klostermann and Thenius in adding an apodosis since the verse is inconclusive without it and LXX^L attests the emendation. The original text probably read 'hr yhwh 'lhykm whwšy'km. A scribe omitted the last word because of homoioteleuton.

15. b'btykm ("against your fathers"). This is a meaningless statement and suggests corruption of the text.

Thenius²¹² and Driver²¹³ amend to wbmlkkm on basis of LXX. They fail to note, however, that LXX^L and numerous minuscules including Luc. read ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα ὑμῶν ἐξολοθεῖσαι ὑμᾶς ("and against your king to destroy you"). Hence, I would amend and add bkm wbmlkkm lh'bydkm.²¹⁴

21. tswrw ky 'hry hthw. The ky is untranslatable here. Arnold Ehrlich proposes that it is a corruption of llkt, as found in Deut. 11:28.²¹⁵ However, deletion with LXX

²¹¹Driver, Notes, p. 94.

²¹²Thenius, op. cit., p. 48.

²¹³Driver, Notes, pp. 94-95.

²¹⁴Klostermann, op. cit., p. 39.

²¹⁵Arnold Ehrlich, Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel (Leipzig, 1910), III, 209.

and Vulgate is preferable since the phrase in Deuteronomy is not exactly parallel.²¹⁶ The use of thw in this phrase points to a meaning of the word which is most common in II Isaiah. Out of the seventeen instances of thw in the Old Testament, seven occur in II Isaiah, namely 40:17, 23; 41:29; 44:9; 45:18, 19; 59:4. In this group, the closest parallel in meaning is Is. 44:9, where the author ridicules the makers of idols: "All who fashion idols are nothing and their desires are of no profit..." Elsewhere in II Isaiah the term variously signifies the meaninglessness or non-existence of nations (Is. 40:17), their rulers (Is. 40:23), or molten images (Is. 41:29). In Is. 59:4, the trust of those who practice law is said to be based on thw. Only once does thw signify a cosmological chaos or void as it does in Gen. 1:2, namely in Is. 45:18. In Is. 45:19, thw is the opposite of the truth and right in which God is revealed. Hence, the meaning in 12:21 closely approximates the predominant usage in II Isaiah, where thw is used in indictments of man's desire for the empty gods of his own creation. Interestingly, this use of thw is not found in the other occurrences of the word, where it signifies the cosmic void (Gen. 1:2; Job 26:7) or desolation (Jer. 4:23; Job 6:18; 12:24). The meanings in Is. 29:21; 34:11 are not easily categorized. In Is. 29:13, thw occurs only as an emendation.

²¹⁶Driver, Notes, p. 95. Wellhausen, Text., p. 79.

23. hlylh ly mht' ("Far be it from me to sin...") Driver insists that the phrase be translated, "Far be it for me to sin...";²¹⁷ the difference in meaning is insignificant. hlylh ly occurs by itself in 2:30 and in 14:45. Of greater note is the occurrence in Jos. 24:16, for here it marks a protestation of innocence and pledge of (covenant) faithfulness: wy'n h'm wy'mr hlylh lnw m'zb 't-yhwh l'bd 'lhym 'hrym ("the people answered and said, 'Far be it from us to forsake Yahweh to serve other gods!").

After b'dkm, LXX^B reads w'bdty 't-yhwh ("I will serve Yahweh"), perhaps as a contrast to the mht' of the preceding phrase.²¹⁸ LXX^L and Luc. alter the person of the verb: δοιλευσόμεν. Normally LXX^L would be followed; however, Samuel consistently speaks in the first person here. I would amend according to LXX^B.

✓ b^ederek. If this were construct form, the succeeding adjectives would be masculine, according to Wellhausen (cf. smn htwb, II Kgs. 20:13; qnh htwb, Jer. 6:20).²¹⁹ The parallel is not exact, however. To speak of the "way of the good" differs from the "good way." Probably it should be re-vocalized to baderek, in accord with LXX.²²⁰

²¹⁷Driver, Notes, p. 96.

²¹⁸Thenius, op. cit., p. 48. Wellhausen, Text, p. 79.

²¹⁹Wellhausen, Text, p. 79. Cf. Klostermann, op. cit., pp. 39-40, who reads it as a construct.

²²⁰Budde, Books, p. 60. Driver, Notes, p. 96.

15:1-35.

1. lqwl dbry yhwh. LXX^L and Luc. attest MT in this reading. However, LXX^B reads the more common lqwl yhwh. Thenius follows LXX^B.²²¹ Wellhausen suggests that the expanded reading in MT and Lucian resulted from a conviction that lqwl yhwh was an anthropomorphism.²²² Nevertheless MT preserves the more difficult reading, which I would follow.
2. pgdty. LXX^B adds 'th'. It is not attested in LXX^L nor in Luc., however. The addition is not necessary.²²³
3. whhrrmtm. LXX^B is conflate here with two translations of the verb (ἐξολεθεύσεις and ἀναθεματίζεις). The object of these verbs is singular (αὐτόν). Hence, amend to whhrrmtw w't ("you shall devote him and..."), which agrees with the context of the verse. Wellhausen suggests that double waw was confused for mem.²²⁴
4. way^{ev}samma' ("he caused to hear"). The Pi'el is attested in 23:8. The verb need not be re-vocalized.²²⁵
btl'ym. Most scholars amend to btl'm, cf. Jos. 15:24.²²⁶

²²¹Thenius, op. cit., p. 67.

²²²Wellhausen, Text, p. 96.

²²³Ibid., p. 96.

²²⁴Ibid.

²²⁵Driver, Notes, p. 122.

²²⁶Driver, Notes, p. 122. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 56. Wellhausen, Text, p. 96.

This location for a battle with the Amalekites seems too far south. LXX reads Γαλαάλοις here, and the text should be amended to bglgl, where Saul has appeared before (11:15) and appears later (15:12).²²⁷

4b. LXX^B exaggerates the number of soldiers to "four hundred thousand divisions (!) and "thirty thousand divisions." As Wellhausen notes, the parallelism of "men of Judah" with "foot soldiers" is strange. He recommends deletion of the entire reference to Judah, w'srt 'lpym 't-'yš yhw dh.²²⁸

Thenius adds 't-'yš ysr'l after rgly.²²⁹ Klostermann deletes both the reference to foot soldiers and the reference to the men of Judah.²³⁰ While emendation is not warranted, Wellhausen may be correct insofar as the closing phrase could easily have been a later addition to an already complete statement.

5. 'yr. LXX reads the plural 'ry. The succeeding battle is confined to one area, however.²³¹

wyrb ("he lay in wait"). LXX translates with ἐνέδρευεν ("he lay in ambush"). The orthography is defective (wyrb < wy'rb), probably because aleph ceased to be pronounced (cf. GK 68i,

²²⁷Thenius, op. cit., pp. 67-68.

²²⁸Wellhausen, Text, p. 96.

²²⁹Thenius, op. cit., p. 68.

²³⁰Klostermann, op. cit., p. 56.

²³¹Wellhausen, Text, p. 97.

23d).²³² Surprisingly Thenius ignores the witness of LXX and follows Targum which reads wtqym mšrytyh bnhl' ("he set his camp in the valley"). Thenius amends wyrb to wy'rk and bnhl to mlhnh.²³³

6. mtwk 'mlqy. The adjectival form is attested in LXX. No emendation is necessary, contra Kittel. The same phrase occurs again at the close of the verse where the noun 'mlq is used. Possibly final yodh has been lost in transmission. Luc. reads 'Αμαληκίτου here, but LXX^{BL} reads 'Αμαλήκ.

'm - kl- bny- ys'r'l. LXX reads simply μετὰ τῶν ὑμῶν 'Ισραήλ. Since haplography is the most common error, I would retain MT (contra Klostermann).²³⁴

qyny. This form parallels 'mlqy earlier. The determinative would be expected but is not necessary.²³⁵

7. 't - 'mlq. Luc. repeats the verb here: "Saul smote Amalek, he smote them..." This is not attested elsewhere, however.

mhwyh. The reference, which is taken as a proper name by LXX (Εὐεῖλατ), should denote a boundary of the Amalekite region. In the parallel phrase in Gen. 25:18 the place appears too distant from Palestine, however. Therefore,

²³²Driver, Notes, p. 122.

²³³Thenius, op. cit., p. 68.

²³⁴Klostermann, op. cit., p. 56.

²³⁵Wellhausen, Text, p. 97.

Wellhausen amends to mtlm in accord with v. 4.²³⁶ While the question of location of hwylh must remain open, emendation is not justified simply on the grounds of the parallel in v. 4. The term may be simply a vague designation for fringe areas of Palestine.

9. hmsnym w'l - hkrym. The phrase defies translation as it stands. LXX^{BL} read τῶν ἐδεσμάτων καὶ τῶν ἀμπελῶνων, which may have rendered whmt'mym ("delicacies") and hkrmym ("the vineyards"). Targum reads wsmyny' wptymy' without

'l. The LXX reading combines two very dissimilar types of booty. Probably the text should be amended in light of Targum to read hsmnym whkrym ("fatted animals and lambs").²³⁷

nmbzh wnms. The first word involves a scribal error. The niphal of bzh (nbzh; "despised") is attested by LXX and other versions. Driver suggests that a scribe started to write the second word by mistake and then did not erase nm.²³⁸ The second term seems inappropriate ("wasted away"?). Wellhausen reads the verb m's ("to reject") and combines it with the following 't; hence, nm'st ("rejected").²³⁹ The versions show considerable variety in

²³⁶Wellhausen, Text, p. 97. Cf. also Driver, Notes, p. 123. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 56.

²³⁷Thenius, op. cit., pp. 68-69. Wellhausen, Text, p. 98.

²³⁸Driver, Notes, p. 124.

²³⁹Wellhausen, Text, p. 98.

translating nms (Targum bsyr; LXX^B ἐξουθενωμένον). Significantly LXX^L and Luc. both read ἀπεγνωσμένον ("despaired of"). I would accept Wellhausen's emendation.

11. wyhr. Targum (tyyp; "to be troubled") and Vulgate (contristatus est) dispute MT. Kittel suggests that the text be amended to wysr, therefore. However, LXX confirms MT by reading ἠθύμησεν.

12. wyskm šmw'l. LXX^{BL} adds ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἀπάντησιν Ἰσραὴλ πρωί. "Samuel arose early and went to meet Israel . . ." Klostermann contends that yšr'l could easily have been altered to lqr't š'wl as MT reads.²⁴⁰ Thenius would also follow LXX and add wylk after šmw'l.²⁴¹ LXX omits lqr't š'wl. In v. 12b LXX^B significantly alters the text by reading,

It was declared to Saul, 'Samuel has gone to Carmel and erected a monument. He turned the chariot around and went to Gilgal to Saul. Behond, he (i.e., Saul) had brought a burnt offering to Yahweh, the first things of the booty which he took from Amalek.

The reference to Saul's sacrifice which Samuel unexpectedly discovers is suspicious since it contradicts 15:14 where Samuel hears but does not see the sacrificial animals.

The addition is explained by its repetition of the theme of 13:7b-15.²⁴² LXX^L contains the same addition, except

²⁴⁰Klostermann, op. cit., p. 57.

²⁴¹Thenius, op. cit., p. 69.

²⁴²Wellhausen, Text, p. 99.

that it follows MT in reading that "it was told to Samuel, 'Saul has come...' No emendation of MT is required.

15. LXX alters the tense of the verbs so that Saul says, "I have brought...I have spared."

16. wy'mrw. The plural is not expected. Qere provides the necessary reading, wy'mr.

17. hlw' 'm - qtn 'th b'ynyk r's šbty vār'l. The phrase has caused speculation. LXX^B saw it as a derogatory question: "Are you not least in His eyes, O ruler of the tribes of Israel?" Thus, b'ynyw ("in his eyes") was read. The passage is reminiscent of Saul's modest claim in 9:21, and LXX^L expands MT accordingly: "Are you not small in your own eyes, coming from the tribe of Benjamin, the least of the tribes of Israel. Yet..." In spite of LXX^B, the second person suffix (b'ynyk) is correct, especially in light of LXX^L. Samuel apparently summons Saul to exercise his proper authority: "Although you are least in your own eyes, are you not head of the tribes of Israel?"²⁴³

18. wy'mr lēk. Apparently l^ekā has dropped out, due to identical consonants. LXX witnesses to the entire phrase. 'd klwtm 'tm. As it stands, the phrase reads, "until they destroy them." This is improbable since the commission is to Saul personally. Read with LXX (ἕως συντελέσης αὐτούς)

²⁴³Driver, Notes, p. 126. Smith, op. cit., pp. 136, 138. Wellhausen, Text, pp. 99-100.

and Targum (dtšysy ythwn) 'd klwtk 'tm ("until you destroy them").

21. 'lhyk. LXX reads 'lhynw. Targum follows MT, which is the more unusual and thus probably the original reading (cf. 12:19 for the same expression).

23. w'wn wtrpym. "Idols and teraphim." However, a parallel to ht't is desirable. LXX reads ὁδύνη καὶ πόνος θεραπεΐαν ἐπάγουσιν ("pain and toil bring treatment"?). Perhaps MT should be amended to w'wn trpym ("the guilt of idols").²⁴⁴

hpsr. The Hiphil form is a hapex legomenon. As Hiph. infinitive it perhaps means "presumption, arrogance."

Klostermann amends to hps r' ("evil desire").²⁴⁵ However, the text need not be amended. We may read "for rebellion is as the sin of divination and presumption as (bad as) the guilt of idols..."

wym'sk mmlk ("he rejects you as king"). LXX elaborates, "Yahweh rejects you from being king over Israel." However, this destroys the meter and sounds like an editorial expansion. Cf. 8:7 for the verbal form mimm^elēk ("being king").

24. dbryk. LXX reads the singular, ῥῆμα σου.

27. LXX adds 't - pnw after šmw'l ("Samuel turned his

²⁴⁴Driver, Notes, p. 127. Klostermann, op. cit., p. 59.

²⁴⁵Klostermann, op. cit., p. 59. Budde, Samuel, pp. 111-12. Budde reads "evil desire is as bad as the guilt of idols."

face...") This seems an unnecessary addition. Of more consequence is the question of the subject of 27b, where MT reads "he held the hem of his garment and it ripped." LXX adds Σαοὺλ: "Saul held the hem of his (Samuel's) garment and it ripped." However, the next verse suggests that it is Saul's garment, namely his kingdom, which is ripped away. LXX writers sought to deny this action to Samuel and confused the verse's meaning.²⁴⁶

28. 't - mmlkwt ysr'l ("the kingdom of Israel"). One would expect mamleket, but Driver notes parallels in II Sam. 16:3 (byt ysr'l 't mmlkwt 'by, "the house of Israel, the kingdom of my father"), Hos. 1:4, Jer. 26:1.²⁴⁷

32. m'dnt. LXX reads τρέμων, and Targum renders with mpnq'. The word may derive from the root of 'dynh, meaning "voluptuous" (Is. 47:8; Ps. 36:9). However, this scarcely fits the context. Probably LXX is to be followed and an adverb from m'd ("to tremble") is called for: m°'ādanīt ("trembling"); cf. GK 100g.²⁴⁸

sr mr-hmwt. LXX omits sr, possibly because of homoio-teleuton.

²⁴⁶Klostermann, op. cit., p. 59.

²⁴⁷Driver, Notes, p. 128.

²⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 129-30.

CHAPTER IV

THE ANTI-MONARCHICAL SOURCE

1. Extent of the Source

In Chapter II it was noted that numerous scholars have identified a source in the Samuel traditions which is distinguished by its opposition to the monarchy and a pre-eminent position for Samuel in Israel's life. In this "anti-monarchical" source, to use Wellhausen's phrase,¹ Samuel is portrayed as the charismatic ruler of Israel. He exhorts the people to put away foreign gods, leads them in a rite of repentance, and then miraculously vanquishes the Philistines (7:3-17). In spite of their deliverance, the people are ungrateful and desire to be like other nations who have a king. Samuel warns them of the evils of a king, but is urged to grant their request by Yahweh (8:1-22). The source continues in 10:17-27, where the new king is chosen by lot and acclaimed by the people. This event occurs at Mizpah and also in all probability does the speech of Samuel in chap. 12, if the source continues directly with 12:1. Here the choice of a king is reviewed against the background of Yahweh's saving

¹Wellhausen, Composition, pp. 242-43.

deeds and of Samuel's faithfulness as leader of his people (12:1-15). Samuel's solemn warning to the people and the king (12:19-25) is a foreboding of the somber events of chap. 15, the final passage of the source: At Gilgal, the scene of an earlier rebuke (13:7b-15), Saul is severely reprimanded for failing to devote the spoils of war to Yahweh. Samuel not only rebukes him but completes the awful task of imposing herem himself (15:32-33).² This approximate identification of the material belonging to a single source, while generally agreed upon, requires considerable refinement in some instances. Various discrepancies have been claimed by scholars, often with merit. In establishing the exact limits of the source, I will proceed in order through the passages dealing with the establishment of the monarchy. The birth and call narrative will then be discussed.

In a recent article, Horst Seebass³ has contended that the theme of rejection of Yahweh as king in 8:1-22 has been interrupted by a section on the perils of kingship (vv. 11-18). Hence, the "No!" of the people in v. 19 properly responds to the claim of v. 9 that kingship is a

²Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, pp. 208-09. Eissfeldt, Komposition, pp. 6-7. Smith, op. cit., pp. xvi-xvii. Cf. also M. H. Segal, Sifre Shemuel (Jerusalem, 1956).

³Horst Seebass, "Traditionsgeschichte von I Sam. 8, 10f, und 12," ZAW LXXVII (1965), 286-96.

rejection of Yahweh. The same exchange between Samuel and the people is repeated in 10:19. Furthermore, Seebass believes that v. 9 originally stood at the close of the chapter as an introduction to the presentation of laws on the king in 10:25. It occupies its present position as an introduction to the pericope, vv. 11-18.⁴ The relocation of v. 9 is not significant and is largely conjecture. The basis of Seebass' argument with regard to vv. 11-18 is the context in 10:19. He fails to note, however, that the exclamation of the people is repeated a second time in 12:12, in a different context.

In his study, Ivar Hylander similarly re-orders chap. 8 in accord with his identification of four discernible layers of tradition in Samuel. The list of royal abuses (vv. 11-18) is deleted and v. 21 is inserted after v. 6. Hylander does not contend that the former belongs to a different strand than the remainder of chap. 8 (i.e., the Abiathar strand), but he does argue that it is part of the scene of Saul's accession: 12:6; 10:19-23, 24; 12:1-15; 10:25a; 8:11-18; 10:25b, 26, 10-12.⁵ The reference to Samuel's circuit as a judge and the failure of his sons to follow in his ways (7:15-8:3) is a late addition. It is part of the effort of a post-exilic, priestly redactor to

⁴Ibid., pp. 286-88.

⁵Hylander, op. cit., pp. 218, 301-02.

combine the Abiathar strand with an Elohist strand written by the circles close to Jeremiah, which elevates the role of Samuel, as is evident in the strand itself (in chap. 7, vv. 3-4, 5-61, 6-8, 9ab, 10, 11, 14a) and in the reference of Jeremiah to Samuel in Jer. 15:1.⁶

Contrary to both Hylander and Seebass, the list of the corrupt practices of kings seems well suited to its context as a reminder to the people of possible consequences of their acts. 7:15-16 continues in the same narrative style as the preceding verses (cf. "all Israel" in v. 15 and v. 5); Samuel's role as judge is illustrated in 7:3. 8:1-3 form the essential context for the petition of the elders in v. 4. Samuel is passing from the scene and his sons are unworthy; hence, the need for a ruler presents itself. These verses hardly need be assigned to a late redactor. Whereas chaps. 7 and 8 appear as complete units and parts of a single tradition, such is not the case with the small unit narrating the choice of Saul by lot (10:17-27). The brief passage in vv. 25b-27 is probably an editorial addition to provide the transition to chap. 11.⁷ The dark reference to Saul's detractors prepares for the mood of revenge in 11:12. With the same thought in mind, Cornill removed 10:26-27 to substitute it for v. 8 in

⁶Ibid., pp. 237-38, 310.

⁷Budde, Samuel, p. 72. Smith, op. cit., p. 72.

chap. 11, since the number of Israelites mentioned in the latter is clearly an exaggeration.⁸ The purpose of the editor in placing these verses at the end of chap. 10 is clear, however. Samuel dismisses the people, which allows for the events at Jabesh-Gilead before resumption with Samuel's speech in chap. 12. The (original) direct continuation of vv. 17-25a in chap. 12 suggests itself naturally. Again departing significantly from the order of the received text, Seebass removes vv. 25b-27 to another context: the narrative strand which emphasizes the king and people's position under the sacred law. In his strand, 10:19b-24 is followed directly by 12:1-6a, 7a, 6b. Then in place of the recital of past events (vv. 8-12) Seebass conjectures that a pericope of royal law followed, which was concluded by 10:25b-27. Such a reconstruction is suggested, he argues, by the small unit vv. 13-15 which summarize the law in the form of conditionals.⁹

Verses 19-24 are not an entirely consistent pericope, however. The problem centers on v. 22a, "So they inquired again of Yahweh, 'Has the man come yet?'"¹⁰ Not only has attention shifted from Samuel to an unidentified

⁸ Cornill, "Ein elohistischer Bericht," pp. 113-40.

⁹ Seebass, "Traditionsgeschichte," pp. 288-89.

¹⁰ LXX version here adopted.

group, but the question is not to be expected from the events of vv. 17-21ab which presume that Saul is among the people. Verse 22a seems to pre-suppose that the men are assembled but without their leader who has not yet arrived. Eissfeldt concludes that 21b β -27 is a separate tradition. The acclaim for Saul, expressed both by the people and by Samuel, is not in keeping with the preceding accounts in chaps. 7, 8 and 10:17-21ab.¹¹ Noth agrees with Eissfeldt that the author has utilized a separate tradition of the choice of Saul, but he views vv. 17-27 as a unit. If one divides the pericope, vv. 17-21ab stand without a conclusion and vv. 21b β -27 without an introduction.¹² I find a suitable conclusion to vv. 17-21ab in v. 25a where Samuel duly records the law to which the king is subject. Hence, vv. 21b β -24 and 25b-27 belong to another source or in the case of vv. 25b-27 derive from the hand of an editor.

The speech of Samuel in I Sam. 12 is generally viewed as a unity.¹³ Exceptions to this position have been raised, however, as in the traditio-historical study

¹¹Eissfeldt, Komposition, pp. 7-8.

¹²Martin Noth, Studien, p. 58.

¹³Budde, Samuel, p. 77. Cornill, "Ein elohistischer Bericht," pp. 140-41. Eissfeldt, Komposition, pp. 7, 10. Noth, Studien, pp. 54-55. Richard Press, "Der Prophet Samuel. Eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung," ZAW LVI (1938), pp. 215-16. Smith, op. cit., p. 82.

of Hylander, who separates Samuel's self-defense in the opening verses from the exhortation to the people and the king in 12:7-25. The former (vv. 1-6) are part of Hylander's Abiathar strand whose major theme is opposition to the king. These verses reflect the attempt to portray Samuel as the agent for kingship contrary to his own judgment. There is a suggestion that Samuel's own position is being threatened in his passionate defense of his own performance.¹⁴ Verses 7-25 are part of Hylander's third layer of tradition, or Jeremianic strand. Samuel's position as a second Moses is prominent in this source, and 12:7-25 is an expansion of Samuel's speech at the anointing of Saul. It was delivered at Mizpah and the verses directly follow on 10:17-18.¹⁵

In a similar approach, Seebass also identifies two separate traditions in chap. 12. The account of Samuel's judgment on the people and their repentance (vv. 16-25) forms a pericope which is inappropriate in this context since it maintains that the choice of a king is evil (vv. 20a, 21). This is an unlikely position for the author to maintain after kingship has become a reality (vv. 13-15). Seebass suggests that vv. 16-25 originally followed 8:11-18. These two units are part of an old tradition which contrasted

¹⁴Hylander, op. cit., pp. 218, 239.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 300-01, 311.

the theocratic leadership of Samuel (most of chap. 7) with the evil and unfounded desire for a king.¹⁶ In 12:1ff the demand for a king, which has been granted, is related to the controlling precepts of sacred laws. The king is chosen by Yahweh, and the law obligates both king and people to obedience to their Lord. As noted above (p. 124), Seebass suggests that originally a pericope of such law preceded vv. 13-15, only to be later deleted for the recital of saving events which stands in vv. 8-12.¹⁷

Seebass' analysis suffers from a hyper-critical approach which produces an overly complex solution based on an exclusively literary-thematic approach. The conjecture that royal law has been deleted has little demonstrable basis. More importantly, the pattern of recital of saving events followed by conditionals (vv. 14-15) is well-attested in such passages as Josh. 24 (vv. 1-13, Heilsgeschichte; vv. 14-15, the conditionals which define Israel's relation to her God) and in extra-Biblical materials.¹⁸ Nor is it clear that vv. 16-25 belong strictly to the

¹⁶Seebass, "Traditionsgeschichte," pp. 292-95.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 288-89.

¹⁸Adolphe Lods analyses a tablet from Mari in which an oracle of the god Adad is delivered to Zimri-Lin. This oracle has two parts: a recitation of the prowess of the god and then an exhortation in the form of conditionals: if the king is disobedient he will perish but if he obeys, great fortune will be his. "Une Tablette Inedite de Mari," Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh, 1950), pp. 103-110.

period prior to the choice of a king. The demonstration by miracle of Yahweh's fearsome power to command obedience presumes the existence of the monarchy, since v. 25 concludes, "But if you still do wickedly, you shall be swept away, both you and your king." Seebass gives no attention to the Gattung of the chapter, nor to the not infrequent observation that the pericope is remarkably similar to Jos. 24.¹⁹ Proper attention to the form and thus the meaning of the passage would stress its essential integrity (see below, p. 261, for a detailed discussion).

On the other hand, 15:1-35 is not a unified account.²⁰ Numerous doublets and discrepancies suggest more than one narrative strand. Thus, v. 8 speaks of the herem, yet v. 9 records that some were spared. In vv. 24-26, no forgiveness is possible. Samuel says to Saul, "I will not return with you. . . ." (v. 26). Yet according to v. 31, he does return. In both 13b and 20a it is stated that Saul obeyed the word of Yahweh. Between these verses, the passage in 15:16-19 is an addition. Samuel indicts Saul because the people have eaten the spoils of war

¹⁹Baltzer, op. cit., pp. 29-37. McCarthy, op. cit., p. 145. Muilenburg, "Covenantal Formulations," p. 364. Smith, op. cit., p. 82.

²⁰Wellhausen viewed 15:2-35 as the beginning of the "erste Geschichte Davids," which continues through II Samuel 8, rather than as the conclusion of the Samuel - Saul traditions. Composition, p. 246. This has not found general acceptance. The chief protagonists continue to be Samuel and Saul in this chapter. Artur Weiser, "I Samuel 15," ZAW LIV (1936), 4.

(wt't 'l - hšll, v. 19). This refers to the incident in 14:32-35 (cf. v. 32, wy't h'm t-hšll; Qere). The sin of Saul and the people after the Amalakite battle is of a different kind. Yahweh is angry because Saul has spared Agag (v. 8) and because the people have used the spoils of war for a sacrifice (v. 21). Thus, the passage does not agree with its immediate context. Seebass places it immediately after 14:32-35. The references in vv. 11 and 29 are contradictory concerning God's repentance; v. 29 appears to be an explicit denial that God could repent as a man does.²¹

On the basis of such phenomena, Seebass isolates two narrative strands, the oldest of which is comprised of vv. 4-8, 12-13, 20-21, 29, 30a, 31a, 32-34. This account narrates events following the Amalekite war. A basic concern is Saul's desire to redress the curse he is under for the events of 14:32-35. Hence, Saul offers a major victory sacrifice (vv. 12-13), but to no avail (vv. 29-30a). This account was presumably expanded with Samuel's question (v. 14) and the judgment pericope in vv. 22-23. The other narrative is a rejection pericope which specifically seeks to relate Saul's rejection to the events of the Amalekite war. He is severely rebuked for failing to devote all the

²¹Horst Seebass, "I Sam 15 als Schlüssel für das Verständnis der sogenannten königsfreundlichen Reihe I Sam 9:1-10:16, 11:1-15, 13:2-14:52," ZAW LXXVIII (1966), 149-54.

spoils; this strand comprises vv. 1, 11, 16-19, 24-28.

The effect of this interpolation is to place Saul's rejection at the height of his career: "Auf der äussersten Höhe seiner Macht ist König Saul verworfen worden so dass sein Königtum sich langsam von innen her selbst zerstörte."²²

Weiser has not carried literary analysis as far as does Seebass, but he also recognizes contradictions and duplications. These center on vv. 25-30a (through ht'ty) where Saul confesses his sin, only to do so again in v. 30; the basis for rejection differs in vv. 26 and 23. Finally, Weiser notes the contradiction of v. 29 with v. 11 (and v. 35) which claim that Yahweh can repent. Two purposes of the passage in vv. 25-30a are clear: it serves to anticipate the anointment of David in chap. 16, and it emphasizes Samuel's religious authority, since Saul approaches him for forgiveness. Accordingly Weiser takes vv. 25-30a as the only exception to the unity of the passage.²³

Weiser does identify three units in the chapter: vv. 1-9 which establish the political, i.e., external, framework for the encounter of Samuel and Saul; vv. 10-24, which is the heart of the narrative: the execution of God's word; and finally, the murder of Agag, vv. 30a-35. He views vv. 10-24 as closely related to I Sam 8, 10:17ff, and 12; in

²²Ibid., pp. 175-76.

²³Weiser, "I Samuel 15," pp. 4, 16.

these, Samuel is seized by the zeal for Yahweh and the performance of his will. "Die Ausführung des im Gotteswort enthaltenen Auftrags und das Zusammentreffen Samuels mit Saul in Gilgal schliesst sich im gedrangter Schilderung an."²⁴

One significant aspect of Weiser's analysis lies in his observation that the issue in the passage is not rejection of Saul, which is treated in the public arena elsewhere (e.g., 13:7f; 16:14f; 28:6, 15f), but the realization of Samuel that the demand for absolute loyalty to Yahweh is compromised by kingship, which is subject to the people for its authority. Both the harshness of Yahweh's demand and the tragedy of Saul's all-too-human actions demonstrate that the narrative "nicht aus einer späteren königsfeindlichen Richtung politischer Gedankengildung erklärt werden kann."²⁵ Saul found it impossible to assert the sovereignty of the king in the face of the will of the people, because he lacked the divine authority embodied in Samuel. Saul realizes his sin in v. 30. Tragically it is too late.²⁶ Weiser sees the kingship in a decisive position to oppose other religions during the settlement in Canaan. The prerequisite for this, however, must be

²⁴Ibid., p. 7.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 25-26.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 21-22.

that kingship is understood to exist under the obligation of absolute loyalty to Yahweh.²⁷ This means that the issue of fulfilling the herem is of crucial importance. Samuel's precipitate act (vv. 30ff) is to demonstrate that Yahweh's will cannot be compromised.²⁸

The significance of the analyses of chap. 15 by Seebass and Weiser is that in spite of different conclusions as to the sources and the literary units both scholars minimize the specific act of rejection as derived from a deed of Saul's. In the basic narrative according to Seebass, Saul seeks to memorialize himself after his victory but is forced to confess his sin before Samuel turns to him (v. 31a). Especially in Weiser's analysis is the basic theme of the text seen to be the sovereign word of Yahweh which Samuel guards and administers with absolute impartiality.

The discrepancies and doublets which Seebass identifies suggest that two narratives have been interwoven. He suggests that a later editing (i.e., expansion) of the oldest strand to include v. 14 and vv. 22-23 occurred prior to the addition of the second (independent) account. This is an unnecessary hypothesis; it may be assumed, I believe,

²⁷"Damit ist aber das Königtum in Konsequenz seiner religiösen Basis und Aufgabe an entscheidender Stelle in die Auseinandersetzung der Religionen hineingestellt, die seit der Einwanderung in Kanaan das innere Thema der israelitischen Geschichte bildet." Ibid., p. 23.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 24-27.

that the following verses comprised the older account: vv. 4-8, 12-14, 20-23, 29-30a, 31a, 32-34. This narrative of events surrounding a war with the Amalekites is the continuation of the account in chaps. 7, 8, 10:17-21ab; 12:1-25. Samuel remains as the pre-eminent representative of Yahweh. The obligation of obedience of which Saul is conscious (vv. 13, 20) was the center of Samuel's warning in chap. 12 (cf. 12:14, 20, 24). This chapter does not oppose kingship as such since the fact of the monarchy has been recognized in chap. 12. Yet it does make clear that the king remains subject to Yahweh's word, which is the clear implication of the proclamation of the law which the king is to read (10:25a).

Thus far the passages which I have considered have been confined to those chapters dealing with the establishment of the monarchy and the fate of its first king. These accounts are noteworthy not only for their opposition to the monarchy but also for the status accorded to Samuel as the one who prays for "all Israel" and judges her (7:5, 6, 15), speaks directly with Yahweh (8:6-7), leads Israel in choosing a king by lot (10:17ff), addresses Israel as her pre-eminent leader (12:1-25), and proclaims and protects the sacral law (15:32-34). An introductory portion of this same source probably occurs in chaps. 1-3 where the portentous circumstances of Samuel's birth as well as his call to replace the house of Eli at Shiloh are narrated.

"And Yahweh appeared again at Shiloh, for Yahweh revealed himself to Samuel" (3:21. Cf. Chapter III, loc. cit.).

The tenor of the chapters is clear, both in the strong contrast of Samuel with the house of Eli and of these chapters with the ones immediately following which center on the ark and fail to mention Samuel at all (chaps. 4-6). The only connection with the preceding chapters occurs in 4:11-22, where the earlier prophecy of the fall of Eli's house is fulfilled.²⁹ The way in which Eli, Hophni, and Phinehas are referred to in 4:4b, 15 hardly suggests the extensive narrative of chaps. 1-3.³⁰

Apart from the obviously late passages in 2:1-11 (Song of Hannah) and 2:27-36 (prophecy of Zadokite priesthood), the birth and call narrative of 1:1-3:21 is a unified account in the view of most scholars. The narrative centers upon Samuel, the hero of Ephraim, and upon Shiloh, the Ephraimite sanctuary.³¹ The objections to this conclusion are noteworthy however, because there is an undeniable duality of theme in the material. Thus, Noth speaks of three different strands: the birth of

²⁹Joseph Bourke, "Samuel and the Ark: A Study in Contrasts," Dominican Studies VII (1954), 73-76.

³⁰Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, pp. 194-95. Nevertheless Budde suggests that chaps. 4-6 are a continuation of 1-3 (his Mizpah source) and not prologue to the Gilgal narrative. Cf. also Carl H. Cornill, "Ein elohistischer Bericht," p. 133.

³¹Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, pp. 194-96. Bourke, op. cit., p. 73. Cornill, "Ein elohistischer Bericht," pp. 133, 140-41. Hertzberg, op. cit., pp. 43-44.

Samuel (1:1-28; 2:1-11, 18-21), the evil of the house of Eli and its inevitable fate (2:12-17, 22-36) where Samuel is never mentioned, and finally Samuel's call as a prophet (3:1-21). Noth feels that Strands I and II are unrelated to each other but that 3:1-21 (Strand III) was written by an author who sought to unite the themes of I and II: Samuel is called to be a "prophet of God" and the house of Eli is doomed (3:11-14). These events occur at Shiloh, which thus assumes significance vis a vis "all Israel."³² Smith also recognizes the theme of Eli's fate in these chapters. He relates it to the ark narratives and speaks of an early source: 2:12, 17, 22-25, 27-36; 4:1b-7:2. Chaps. 1 and 3 remain as prologue to the anti-monarchical source of later chapters.³³ Similarly Eissfeldt sees the references to Eli's house as part of his Strand II (1:3b; 2:12-17, 22-25, 27-36; this strand continues in the ark narratives although Eissfeldt does not specify the verses); the Samuel tradition per se is a separate narrative: 1:1-3a, 4-28; 2:11, 18b-21; 3:1-10, 15-21 (Strand III).³⁴

It is more significant, however, to recognize the form of the narrative as it now stands: a unity which

³²Martin Noth, "Samuel und Silo," VT XIII (Oct., 1963), pp. 397-98.

³³Smith, op. cit., pp. xix-xx.

³⁴Eissfeldt, Komposition, pp. 4-5.

reflects coherence and meaning. Noth observes that in spite of identifiable smaller pericopes the whole had an existence of its own prior to entry into the Samuel narrative, since the only connection with succeeding chapters is through the person of Samuel. The narrative, when analyzed form-critically, shows a carefully wrought symmetry in which attention centers first on the promise of good in Hannah and Samuel, then on the burden of evil in Eli's sons, and finally on the resolution of such a contrast in the return of the Word of Yahweh through Samuel's call. Attention to basic key phrases of introduction or conclusion (such as "they arose in the morning, 1:19; 3:15 or "Samuel was ministering before Yahweh," 2:11, 18; 3:1) indicate three acts in the drama, each with two scenes.

Act I - The One Asked of God.

Scene 1 - Hannah's prayer and vow, 1:1-18.

v. 18b - "Then the woman left and ate; her face was no longer sad."

Scene 2 - Birth and Dedication of Samuel, 1:19-28; 2:11.

v. 19 - "They arose early in the morning. . . ."

v. 11b - "And the boy was ministering (mšrt) before Yahweh."

Act II - The Wickedness of Eli's Sons - 2:12-26.

Scene 1 - Contempt for the Sacrifices, 2:12-18.

v. 12a - "Now sons of Eli were worthless men. . . ."

v. 18a - "Samuel was ministering before Yahweh."

Interlude - Hannah's great blessing, 2:19-21.

Scene 2 - Eli's Futile Protest, 2:22-26.

v. 22 - "Now Eli was very old. . . ."

v. 26 - "Now the boy Samuel grew in stature and
favor with Yahweh and with man."

Act III - Samuel's call, 3:1-19.

Scene 1 - The Summons to Samuel, 3:1-9.

v. 1a - "Now the boy Samuel was ministering to
Yahweh under Eli."

v. 9b - "So Samuel went and lay down in his place."

Scene 2 - The Call, 3:10-19.

v. 10 - "And Yahweh came and stood forth."

v. 19 - "And Samuel grew, and Yahweh was with him
and let none of his words fall to the
ground."

Finale - Samuel as Prophet, 3:20-21.³⁵

"And all Israel from Dan to Beersheba knew that Samuel
was faithful as a prophet before Yahweh. And Yahweh
once again appeared at Shiloh for Yahweh had revealed
himself to Samuel. But Eli was exceedingly old. His
sons followed after him, but their way was evil to

³⁵The analysis is derived chiefly from Bourke, op. cit., pp. 81-82, although I have made certain changes and added to the observation of key words.

Yahweh."³⁶

Although each act has a dominant theme and major dramatic characters, the counterpoint each time is emphasized. Thus, Elkanah and his family go to Shiloh each year, where Eli's sons are priests (v. 3). Hannah prays before Yahweh, but Eli watches her (v. 12). Hannah is greatly blessed (vv. 19ff), but Eli, whose house is doomed, receives her (2:20). In Act II the emphasis is upon Eli's sons, but Samuel's presence scarcely recedes from the reader's mind (cf. 2:18, 21, 26). Act III brings the contrast between good and evil, the new and the old, to a climax and to a resolution, with Yahweh's intervention.³⁷

It is not improbable that Samuel's exhortation to the people in 7:3-17 originally followed directly upon 3:19-4:1a. The motif that unites the narratives is Samuel's role as the one who proclaims the word of Yahweh. In 3:19-21 we are told that Yahweh has established Samuel as a prophet before all Israel and that none of Samuel's

³⁶Noth has observed perceptively that v. 21 is an addition by an editor, because its theme is the opposite of vv. 19-20. In the latter, Samuel is a prophet over all Israel partly because of his association with the major cult sanctuary at Shiloh. In v. 21, however, a later editor maintains the importance of Shiloh, because of Samuel. The verse comes from a time after the destruction of Shiloh when the memory of Shiloh as a sanctuary had to be preserved. Noth, "Samuel und Silo," p. 399.

³⁷Bourke, op. cit., pp. 81-83.

words shall "fall to the ground" (v. 19). Not surprisingly one of Samuel's first acts is to summon Israel to covenantal loyalty to Yahweh. Juxtaposition of the two passages indicates the continuity in theme:

Samuel grew and Yahweh was with him. He did not cause any word of his to fall to the ground. All Israel from Dan to Beersheba knew that Samuel was faithful as a prophet before Yahweh. And Yahweh once again appeared at Shiloh for Yahweh revealed himself to Samuel. But Eli was exceedingly old. His sons followed after him, but their way was evil to Yahweh. The word of Samuel came to all Israel. And Samuel spoke to all the house of Israel saying, 'If with all your heart you return to Yahweh and set aside the foreign gods from among you and the ashtaroth, and direct your heart to Yahweh, and serve him only, he will deliver you out of the hand of the Philistines.' (3:19-4:1a; 7:3)

Notable differences in narrative style and theological concerns between the birth and call narrative on the one hand and the account of the fate of the ark (4:1b-7:2) on the other indicate that the latter was inserted into the Samuel traditions by another hand. The ark narrative fails to mention Samuel, and centers on the fate of the ark. There is a notable absence of individual characters, that were prominent in the birth and call narrative. Instead the ark itself is personalized, as it makes its own decision on the direction of travel (6:9, 12). Bourke and Rost argue convincingly that the ark narrative comes from southern circles. The purpose of the account is a narrative of the fate of the ark, the southern kingdom's central religious symbol and her claim

to continuity with Moses and the exodus traditions.³⁸
 After the battle of Aphek, the ark sanctuary of the north
 ceased to exist. The ark upon its return is located in
 the south and eventually is moved to Jerusalem. The
 jubilation of Judah is revealed in Ps. 78:

He rejected the tent of Joseph,
 he did not choose the tribe of Ephraim;
 but he chose the tribe of Judah,
 Mount Zion, which he loves. (vv. 67-68)

Whereas the north traces its heritage to the Mosaic age
 through Samuel, the south now does so by the ark which
 David enshrines in Jerusalem (II Sam. 6).³⁹

My analysis has suggested evidence for the essen-
 tial unity of the material in 1:1-3:21. Clearly the
 author is concerned with Samuel throughout, not only with
 the beginnings of the prophet but his intimate connection
 with Shiloh and the contrast with the decline of the house
 of Eli. Only with Samuel does Yahweh speak and by him is
 the word of Yahweh proclaimed. This last motif is a theme
 which appears in the succeeding chapters which I have desig-
 nated above as anti-monarchical. In the assembly at Mizpah
 (7:5f), it is Samuel who prays for all Israel. He makes an
 offering to Yahweh, "and Yahweh answered him." 8:7ff

³⁸Ibid., pp. 78-79, 89-90. Leonhard Rost, Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids (Stuttgart, 1926), pp. 36, 38.

³⁹Bourke, op. cit., pp. 99, 102-03.

recounts Samuel's private exchange with his God concerning the dispute over a king. The miraculous sign in 12:18ff is at Samuel's request to Yahweh. The theme of Yahweh's exclusive revelation to Samuel, as well as other themes which follow through the pericopes designated above, is important evidence that a continuous source is present. It remains to discuss the evidence for such a source, particularly because of recent exception that has been taken to such a view (see below, p. 147). Only then can one consider significant terms and themes as representative of a single source.

The narrative, as contained in I Sam. 1:1-28; 2:11-26; 3:1-21; 7:3-8:22; 10:17-21ab, 25a; 12:1-25; 15:4-8, 12-14, 20-23, 29-30a, 31a, 32-34, represents a closely integrated, consistent account. Throughout, Samuel is clearly the central figure. The opening chapters are devoted to his birth and call; the issue of a king is personified between Samuel as leader of "all Israel" and Saul. Samuel can address the nation from his position as leader--a role long and faithfully carried out (12:1-5). Finally Saul must seek Samuel's counsel and mediation for forgiveness (15:30, 31a). The question of the monarchy and the conduct of the king is of central concern in all passages except chaps. 1-3 which deal with events prior to

the rise of the monarchy. More specifically, kingship⁴⁰ is viewed as a desire of the Israelites to be like their neighbors (8:19, 20; 10:19; 12:12); theologically it is condemned as a rejection of Yahweh (8:7b; 10:19a; 12:12, implied). Once kingship is accepted, it is clearly subject to Yahweh's law as mediated by his "prophet." The right of Samuel to rebuke and censor Saul is assumed (10:25a; 12:14ff; 12:25; 15:22-23, 30).

The narrative sequence is quite logical. The air of promise which is accorded Samuel's career is highlighted in the birth and call traditions by the contrast with the barrenness of Hannah and the corruption of the house of Eli. Samuel's role as prophet and judge of "all Israel" is dramatically attested by the defeat of the Philistines and the summary of his circuit as judge (7:15-17). This dramatic victory is the context for chap. 8. In view of Yahweh's victory through Samuel, the demand for a king by the people represents their utter sinfulness and rejection of Yahweh (8:7). Nevertheless, Samuel is commanded to "make them a king" (8:22a) which he proceeds to do at the assembly at Mizpah (10:17-25a).

The king, duly selected and instructed with regard to his duties (10:25a), represents the end of an old order

⁴⁰The term used in this source is consistently mlk (8:6, 7, 9, 10, 19, 20, 22; 10:19; 12:12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 25), whereas in the (roughly) parallel passages the traditions speak first of a nagid (9:16; 10:1).

and the beginning of the new. Hence, Samuel proceeds to address the people at this momentous occasion. His speech in 12:1-25 carefully contrasts his own faithful service with the perils that await people and king in the days ahead. The demand for a king was evil (12:20), yet God's grace is unceasing (12:22); the people must fear God and serve Him faithfully (12:24-25).

The exhortation of the people and king to covenant faithfulness falls upon deaf ears, however. The observance of the ban was incomplete following the battle with the Amalekites, and Saul seeks forgiveness. Samuel, who clearly is the only true representative of Yahweh among the people, proceeds to fulfill the law (15:32-34). Throughout these narratives the religious orientation and concern of the author is predominant: Samuel's advent restores the word of Yahweh at Shiloh. The question of a king centers on rejection of Yahweh; the faithfulness of both people and king to Yahweh is the decisive issue for the future.⁴¹

Scholars have noted that in these chapters under discussion a strikingly uniform language is identifiable.⁴²

⁴¹Eissfeldt, Die Composition, pp. 6-7; Introduction, pp. 271ff. Adolphe Lods, Israel, pp. 355-56. Smith, op. cit., pp. xvi-xviii. Eric Voegelin, Israel and Revelation (Order and History, I; New Orleans, 1956), pp. 242-45.

⁴²Smith, op. cit., pp. xvi, xviii.

Thus, for example, S. R. Driver notes the following phrases which occur in two or more chapters in the material under discussion:

bkl - lbbkm ("with all your heart") - 7:3; 12:20, 24.

't - b'lym w't - h'strt ("Baalim and Ashtaroth") - 7:4; 12:10.

ht'nw ("we have sinned") - 7:6; 12:10.

wthy yd - ywhh b + opponent ("hand of Yahweh was against...") - 7:13; 12:15.

sym + mlk (to establish a king) - 8:5; 10:19.

Yahweh as king - 8:7b; 12:12b.⁴³

A more thorough listing appears below (p. 199) in my analysis of terms in these passages common to both D and E. Of the eighty-four terms noted, almost twenty-five percent occur at least twice. This is notable evidence of a unified source. It does not include the exclamation of the people in demanding a king ("No! A king will reign over us!") which occurs three times in virtually identical wording: 8:19; 10:19; 12:12. Note also the use of mspt in sense of custom or law of a group: 2:13; 8:9, 11; 10:25a.

This source which I have sought to identify is notably distinct from the remaining passages of I Sam. 1-15. Many scholars contend that these passages constitute a second and parallel source, as noted in Chapter II. Generally these passages (I Sam. 4-6; 9:1-10:16; 11:1-15;

⁴³S. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 177.

13:1-7, 15b-14:52) speak much less of Samuel, who still appears as king-maker but only as a local seer (9:6ff, 22-24). The emphasis rests upon Saul, who initially is designated a nagid by Yahweh (9:16) but later is proclaimed king (11:14).⁴⁴ No objection to kingship is raised. Indeed Samuel acts immediately to proclaim Saul as king following the victory at Jabesh-Gilead (11:14-15). The source concludes with a summary of Saul's remarkable deeds in securing the nation against her enemies (14:47ff).⁴⁵

The contrast of the anti-monarchical source with the remaining passages (hereafter called Narrative II) is clear on many accounts. Whereas the obstinate desire of the people lies behind the need for kingship in the former, in Narrative II kingship is a response to outside pressure of the Philistines (9:16) or perhaps the Ammonites (11:1ff.). In the anti-monarchical source, Samuel is a prophet (3:20) and judge (7:15) over all Israel. He is clearly the leader of the people: in battle (7:8ff), in their assemblies (10:17ff), and before Yahweh (8:21;

⁴⁴For discussion of designation nagid, cf. Albright, op. cit., pp. 16-17. H. Wildberger, "Samuel und die Entstehung des israelitischen Königtums," TZ XIII (1957), p. 454. Buber, op. cit., p. 127.

⁴⁵Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 271, 274-75; he sees these chapters as reflecting an early, folkloristic narrative (9:1-10:16; L source) as well as the later J narrative. Smith, op. cit., p. xviii. Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, pp. 209-10. Lods, op. cit., pp. 352-53.

12:19ff). He continues as an important leader in Israel until after Saul becomes king, according to the anti-monarchical account. In Narrative II, however, he steps aside to allow for the rise of Saul.⁴⁶ Following the "renewal" of kingship in 11:14ff, no mention is made of Samuel as Saul proceeds to battle Israel's enemies in 13:1-14:46. 13:7b-15 is an exception to this but its context amidst Saul's victories (cf. 13:4 and 14:20-23, 47-48) and the very reasonableness of Saul's action despite Samuel's rebuke suggest that the passage is an intrusion.⁴⁷ Possibly it is a late attempt (by the Deuteronomist?) to establish Saul's rejection early in his kingship. Some scholars⁴⁸ have suggested that it is part of Narrative II, a direct continuation of 9:1-10:16 and chap. 11, partly because the view of Saul is favorable and because 10:8 anticipates the passage. If so, the account is a parallel (although not contradictory) narrative to the rejection of Saul in the anti-monarchical account of chap. 15.

Contradictions between the two narratives in the Samuel traditions also include the claim of 7:13-14 that Samuel permanently defeated the Philistines in contradiction

⁴⁶Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, p. 172ff.

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 190-93. Smith, op. cit., pp. xx-xxi.

⁴⁸Cornill, "Ein elohistischer Bericht," pp. 140-41. Eissfeldt, Die Komposition, pp. 8-9. Seebass, "I Sam 15," pp. 176-77.

to the narrative in 13:1-14:46, where Saul engages in battle with them. According to 7:12, Eben-ezer is named after Samuel vanquishes the Philistines. Yet in 4:1 and 5:1, the place already bears this name. Finally the significant contrast between the ark narrative and the birth and call narrative suggests the presence of at least two sources.⁴⁹

The case for a continuous independent source which stresses the role of Samuel in Israel and takes strong exception to kingship has been strongly criticized in recent Old Testament scholarship. These criticisms need to be considered. As noted in Chapter II, Weiser contends that several different traditions are identifiable in chaps. 8-12 with regard to the monarchy. These are linked to different cult centers. Thus, while both chapters 8 and 10:17-26 deal with opposition to the kingship, they differ as to place, time, and manner of presenting the opposition of Samuel. At Ramah the elders bring forth the demand; at Mizpah the demands arise from the people assembled there. The account in 10:17-26 is uniquely a sanctuary legend where the purpose is to stress the law which governs kingship.⁵⁰ Weiser's position, however, is weakened by the presence in both pericopes of the Israelites' exclamation: "No! but a

⁴⁹See above, pp. 139-40.

⁵⁰Weiser, Samuel, pp. 62-63, 66.

king will reign over us" (8:19 and 10:19). That two sanctuaries and not one are involved need not suggest two circles of traditions since Samuel is associated with numerous sanctuaries (7:16), as Weiser admits. Even less convincing is the difference in milieu claimed for chaps. 7 and 8. Weiser contends that chap. 7 is an originally separate and independent sanctuary legend. The cult setting and ritual elements of chap. 7 are clearly evident. Yet this accords well with the picture of Samuel elsewhere in the anti-monarchical source, even in chap. 8 where Samuel alone speaks before Yahweh and receives his command (cf. also 10:25a; 15:33).

Weiser's contention that the various traditions concerning the rise of the monarchy have two themes in common is instructive.⁵¹ On the one hand, Samuel is always closely related to the theological claim of Yahweh's absolute sovereignty over his people. However, the claim that Samuel is consistently the dominant figure in the establishment of the monarchy is not as apparent. It is scarcely the case in 11:1-11, 15 where Saul sweeps to victory over the Ammonites and the people make him king.⁵² Even if

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 92-93.

⁵²The account of the people's desire to kill those who doubted Saul (vv. 12-14) is not a part of the Ammonite narrative. These verses originally followed 10:27, where the issue is introduced ("But some worthless fellows said, 'How can this man save us?'"). Probably 11:1-11 was inserted as a demonstration of Saul's abilities. Cf. also W. A. Irwin, "Samuel and the Rise of the Monarchy," *AJSLL* LVIII (April, 1941), 128-29.

LXX of v. 15, which mentions Samuel, is followed, Samuel's role is not prominent. He anoints Saul only after the latter has established himself as military leader. Samuel does not appear as a leader of Israel himself. It is true, however, that for those passages which I have noted as comprising the anti-monarchical source, this theme is indeed uppermost. Weiser's observation is relevant for the material in chaps. 7; 8; 10:17-21ab, 25a; 12:1-25; 15:4-8, 12-14, 20-23, 29-30a, 31a, 32-34 and serves to indicate a unified view. Although chap. 7 makes no reference to the problem of the monarchy, it presents a dramatic instance of Samuel's role in Israel. Because of the theme of the vanquished Philistines, it offers a well-designed background for the sinful demand in chap. 8 that an earthly king is necessary in Israel.

As I have noted in Chapter II Hans Hertzberg has set aside the theory of parallel sources. He comes to conclusions which considerably modify Weiser's position, but he too rejects the possibility of continuous sources because they obscure "differences and nuances" in the traditions.⁵³ This situation is not remedied, however, by speaking of traditions which center around particular sanctuaries. Thus, while Hertzberg speaks correctly of traditions connected with Mizpah that are critical of kingship, the same is no less true of traditions linked with Gilgal,

⁵³Hertzberg, op. cit., pp. 130-31.

such as the account of Saul's rejection when he fails to wait for Samuel to offer sacrifice (13:7b-15) and the stern and unwavering censure of Saul for ignoring the ban (15:1, 11, 16-19, 24-28). Hertzberg himself notes that some traditions associated with Mizpah are quite positive to the kingship, as in 10:17ff.⁵⁴

It would appear then that the nuances of attitudes, which the commentator seeks to highlight, are likewise obscured in Hertzberg's sanctuary theory of sources. This is particularly evident in his discussion of chaps. 11 and 15, which he feels are directly continuous of one another because they derive from Gilgal. He also suggests that in both passages Samuel is linked with Saul and no mention is made of the Philistines.⁵⁵ The similar nature of these chapters vis a vis the issue of monarchy is, however, far from apparent. No regret, or even a second thought, is expressed in chap. 11 as events proceed directly from the intoxicating victory over the Ammonites to the anointing at Gilgal. By contrast, Yahweh's regret that Saul was anointed is the major theme of chap. 15. Thus, the latter has been generally linked with chap. 12.⁵⁶ Surely the theme remains clear: The monarchy, although here accepted as a reality, remains subject to Yahweh's law and to the

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 131.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 123.

⁵⁶Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, pp. 208-09. Eissfeldt, Die Komposition, p. 9. Lods, op. cit., p. 352.

censure of Yahweh's sole representative, Samuel. Suffice it to say that chap. 15 is no more convincingly linked with 11:1-15 than it is with passages, like chap. 15, that are concerned with the shortcomings of kingship.

Hertzberg's understanding of the character of chap. 12 is similar to that of Martin Noth's. The chapter is a speech composed by the Deuteronomist to mark the end of a major period in Israel's history. Hertzberg contends that it is the logical extension of the Mizpah ideology of the kingship but goes considerably beyond it.⁵⁷ It is true that the author accepts the monarchy as a reality, much as the Deuteronomist in his editing of the Books of Kings. Nevertheless the similarities with other anti-monarchical passages are prominent. The exclamation of the people in 8:19 and 10:19 is again repeated in 12:12. The similarities between chap. 12 and chap. 7 are noteworthy: Samuel is the theocratic ruler over Israel. As such he commands a miraculous event (7:10ff; 12:16ff). In both chapters he is intercessor before Yahweh (7:6; 12:19). Furthermore, the relation of chap. 12 to other passages involves not only the attitude toward a king per se but also the view of Samuel which is afforded. Precisely as in other anti-monarchical passages, 12:1-25 portrays Samuel as the major leader of Israel, their prophet-priest who has faithfully executed his office (vv. 1-15) and continues to exhort the

⁵⁷Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 97.

people and the king to covenant obedience (vv. 14-15).

2. Themes in the Elohist and Deuteronomy

My survey of the contributions of scholarship on the composition of I Sam. 1-15 (cf. Chapter II) has shown that scholars have variously labelled the passages designated as the anti-monarchical source either as part of the Elohist source (Budde, Hölscher, Eissfeldt) or as part of the work of the Deuteronomist, an extension of the theology of Deuteronomy (Wellhausen, Lods, Noth). The fact that these passages have been called both Deuteronomic and Elohist indicates the similarities between D and E and suggests that they may derive from a common circle of traditions.

The connection between the Elohist source and Deuteronomy has been often noted by scholars.⁵⁸ Most frequently scholars have stressed the dependence of the one upon the other. R. Brinker notes that "it is evident that both the narrative and the legislative sections of Deuteronomy are chiefly, if not solely, based on the Northern traditions normally marked E."⁵⁹ Other scholars have isolated

⁵⁸For extensive bibliography as well as summary of the most important issues at stake, cf. J. Muilenburg, "The 'Office' of the Prophet in Ancient Israel," The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. Hyatt (Nashville, 1966), pp. 80-81, f.n. 19.

⁵⁹R. Brinker, The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel (London, 1946), p. 196. Cf. also Weiser, The Old Testament, pp. 131-32. G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy. Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible (Nashville, 1952), II, 326. Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 220-22.

particular phenomena for comparison. Thus, the city of Shechem is clearly important for both sources, and the ceremony of covenant renewal at Shechem in Jos. 24 (E) may be likewise indicated in such passages as Deut. 11:26-32 and 27:11-26.⁶⁰ Indeed G. Ernest Wright has claimed for Shechem the origin of the Deuteronomic tradition.⁶¹ In an exhaustive study of apodictic law, Karlheinz Rabast has shown the dependence of the laws in Deuteronomy upon those in the Covenant Code of E.⁶² As will be discussed below, von Rad has demonstrated that the Gattung of Deuteronomy parallels the covenant Gattung of Ex. 19-24.⁶³

In view of these researches which suggest a close relationship of the two sources, I should like to continue the investigation by stressing basic themes which are of importance to both the Elohist source and Deuteronomy. This will serve to indicate that these important narrative complexes derive from similar, if not identical, circles.

Importance of Exodus and Conquest Traditions. A sizeable portion of the passages assigned to E in Exodus and Numbers⁶⁴

⁶⁰ von Rad, Studies, pp. 40-41. Eduard Nielsen, Shechem. A Traditio-Historical Investigation (Copenhagen, 1955), pp. 347ff.

⁶¹ Wright, op. cit., p. 326.

⁶² Karlheinz Rabast, Das apodiktische Recht im Deuteronomium und im Heiligkeitgesetz (Hermsdorf, 1948), pp. 7-17, 47.

⁶³ von Rad, "The Problem of the Hexateuch," pp. 26-33.

⁶⁴ Ex. 1-2; 3; 4:10-17, 27-28, 30a; 5; 6:1; 7-11; 12:31; 13:17-19; 14; 17:1b-7; 18; 19:2-25; 20:1-20; 23:20-33;

deal with the events of the exodus from Egypt or its recollection by the Israelites during their wilderness wanderings. Thus, in the description of events at Sinai, E bases the proclamation of the law upon the saving event of the exodus. Ex. 20:1-2 form the prologue to the law: "And God spoke all these words saying, 'I am Yahweh your God who brought you out of the house of bondage.'" This basis for the covenant between God and man differs from that emphasized in the Yahwist, Ex. 34:6-8.⁶⁵ Prior to the events at Sinai, frequent reference is made to the exodus in the Elohist source. At Rephidim, the people are desperate for water, and they "murmur against Moses," saying "Why did you bring us up out of Egypt, . . ." (Ex. 17:3b). In the important events of Ex. 18, where Jethro instructs his son-in-law in the proper worship of Yahweh and urges upon him the use of "able men . . . and rulers" for deciding minor legal issues, reference is made repeatedly to the deliverance from Egypt. In 18:1, Jethro the Midianite had heard of this great deed. In 18:8, Moses tells Jethro "all that Yahweh had done" in Egypt. Jethro rejoices in this and offers praise to Yahweh (vv. 9-10).

24:3-8, 12, 13b, 18b; 31:18b; 32:1-16, 19-24, 30-35; 33:5-11; Num. 11:4-35; 12; 13-14; 20:11b, 14-21; 21:4-9, 10-35; 22-24; 32. Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 200-01. No agreement exists as to the precise extent of E, but this delimitation is roughly parallel to those in Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 126 and in Hölischer, op. cit., pp. 138-40.

⁶⁵Murray Newman, The People of the Covenant (New York, 1962), p. 44.

Indeed the exodus is the measure of Yahweh's stature above all the gods. Jethro confesses, "Now I know that Yahweh is greater than all gods, because he delivered the people from under the hand of the Egyptians, when they dealt arrogantly with them."

In Numbers 20, the people demand water at Kadesh. They despair and demand to know why they were brought up out of Egypt (20:5). Later in the chapter Moses seeks permission to pass through Edom. In his message to the king of Edom, Moses carefully reviews the sojourn in Egypt, the oppression, Israel's cry to Yahweh, and the deliverance from Egypt (20:14-16). The hint of deliverance from Egypt is given even in Genesis, where God promises to be with Israel (Jacob) in Egypt and to return them again to Canaan (Gen. 46:4).

The motif of the Conquest is expressed in two forms in the Elohist source: the promise of the land, and the narratives of the Conquest. Already Israel has a claim to Palestine in the time of the patriarchs. Jacob buys a field at Shechem (Gen. 33:19ff) and the Elohist carefully records the establishment of "landmarks" in the land, i.e., a marker for Rachel's tomb at Ephrat (Gen. 35:20) and a stone at Bethel where Jacob solemnly vows to give a tithe to Yahweh (Gen. 28:18-22). Numerous references occur in E to the bounty of the land and the joys of the harvest (Num. 13:23ff; 24:5ff). Isaac's blessing upon Jacob reflects the

theme of a land rich in produce: "May God give you of the dew of heaven, and of the fatness of the earth, and plenty of grain and wine" (Gen. 27:28).⁶⁶ In Ex. 23:20, Moses, speaking for Yahweh, concludes the statement of his commands with a reference to the land promised to the Israelites: "Behold, I send an angel before you, to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place which I have prepared."

Turning to the Conquest itself, conclusions concerning Elohist themes are made precarious by the problem of source analysis. Scholars differ widely in identifying a composite JE source,⁶⁷ separate J and E sources,⁶⁸ three parallel sources, LJE,⁶⁹ or no Pentateuchal sources at all.⁷⁰ Hölscher and Weiser give notable precedent, however, to the theory that the account is primarily an Elohist narrative, with occasional evidence of the Yahwist (2:1, 4a, 12b, 13, 17a, 18ab, 19, 21; 3:1; 4:3, 8ab; 5:13-15; 6:25).⁷¹ This

⁶⁶Hölscher, op. cit., p. 235.

⁶⁷Driver, Introduction, p. 106ff.

⁶⁸J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch (London and New York, 1902), pp. 522-23.

⁶⁹Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 250-55.

⁷⁰The most notable theory along these lines is that of M. Noth, who argues that Deuteronomy - II Kings is a Deuteronomic history drawing on originally separate traditions; Studien, passim.

⁷¹Hölscher, op. cit., pp. 24-25. Weiser, The Old Testament, pp. 144-45.

is suggested both by the fact that the cities conquered are northern and that Joshua, the hero about whom these individual sagas are grouped, is from the North (Ephraim) and linked with Shechem.⁷² The bulk of the material in Jos. 1-11 consists of individual accounts of conquest, grouped around Joshua, the leader of all Israel in the writers' view.⁷³

Of particular note in these chapters is the narration of the crossing of the Jordan, the setting up of twelve stones either on the Canaanite shore (4:3) or in mid-stream (4:9), and the circumcising of all males (Jos. 3:1-5:9). The account presents many difficulties for source analysis⁷⁴ partly because no fewer than four important elements of tradition are involved in the narrative: in addition to the etiological accounts of the stones, there is the account of the miraculous crossing of the Jordan (3:1-17) and the presence of the ark, borne aloft by the priests (3:13ff) and located at Gilgal (4:15-20).⁷⁵

⁷²A. Alt, "Josua," Kleine Schriften (München, 1959), I, 176-92. H. Gressmann, Die Anfänge Israels (Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl, I; Göttingen, 1921-22), p. 13-14.

⁷³Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 145.

⁷⁴Attempts to isolate two separate strata have been made by K. Möhlenbrink, "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua," ZAW LXVIII (1938), pp. 238ff; C. A. Keller, "Über einige alttestamentliche Heiligtumslegenden," ZAW LXIII (1956), pp. 85ff.; and J. Dus, "Die Analyse zweier Ladeerzählungen des Josuabuches," ZAW LXXII (1960), pp. 107ff.

⁷⁵Hans-Joachim Kraus, Worship in Israel, tr. Geoffrey Buswell (Richmond, 1966; tr. of Gottesdienst in Israel, Munich, 1962), p. 155.

For our purposes, however, the most important factor in these traditions is that the events at Gilgal specifically link the traditions of exodus and conquest together. On the one hand the Old Testament traditions which speak of Gilgal relate the conquest to this sanctuary.⁷⁶ Gilgal is the first sanctuary in the promised land. From here attacks are launched (Jos. 10:6ff; 14:6). Furthermore, it is at Gilgal that the division of the land takes place (Jos. 14:6). Thus the sanctuary represents the culmination of the conquest and the realization of the promise of the land. Von Rad observes, ". . . der Schlüsselpunkt der Landnahmetradition sind die Ereignisse in Gilgal. Man könnte also genauer sagen, ihr eigentlicher scopus ist weniger die Landnahme als die Landsuweisung an die Stämme durch den Willensentscheid Jahwes."⁷⁷ These events, however, are also intimately related to the crossing of the Sea of Reeds and thus to the exodus. The meaning of the ritualistic crossing of the Jordan is carefully explained by Joshua:

When your children ask their fathers in time to come, 'What do these stones mean?' then you shall let your children know, 'Israel passed over this Jordan on dry ground.' For Yahweh your God dried up the waters of the Jordan for you until you passed over, as Yahweh your God did to the Red Sea, which he dried up for us until we passed over, . . . (Jos. 4:21-23)

Thus, an analogy is drawn between the two events. The

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 153.

⁷⁷Gerhard von Rad, Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs (Stuttgart, 1938), p. 42.

crossing of the Jordan is uniquely suited to a cultic enactment of both the crossing of the sea and the entry into the promised land (cf. Ps. 114:8).⁷⁸ Further reminiscence of the deliverance from Egypt occurs when Joshua commands the circumcision of all those males who were not so treated since the exodus; thus the "curse of Egypt" is removed (5:2-9). Finally, the Passover is observed "on the fourteenth day of the month at evening. . . ." (5:10b).

In Deuteronomy, the traditions of exodus and conquest could hardly be more prominent. The most important instances are the credos identified by Gerhard von Rad and the Gattung of the book itself. For both analyses we are indebted to von Rad's traditio-historical and form-critical discussion.⁷⁹

Amidst hortatory material the authors of Deuteronomy have placed a small pericope (6:20-24) which is in response to the question of the meaning and significance of the laws prescribed for all Israelites. This brief statement reviews two primary events in the saving deeds of Yahweh: the deliverance from Egypt (vv. 21-23a) and the inheritance of the land (v. 27b). Von Rad stresses that no mention is made of the events at Sinai--neither here nor in any such credal statements (Deut. 26:5b-9; Jos. 24; Ps. 132; Ex. 15).⁸⁰

⁷⁸Kraus, Worship, pp. 156-59.

⁷⁹von Rad, "The Problem of the Hexateuch," pp. 1-78.

⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 6, 10, 11.

This objection may not be decisive, however.⁸¹ The cultic function of such a credo is more evident in Deut. 26 where two prayers are recorded, one for the festival of first fruits, the other for tithing. The litany of vv. 5b-9 is the required response before Yahweh of any worshipper presenting the "first of all the fruit of the ground." In this credo, every Israelite recites the sacred history of the people: sojourn in Egypt; affliction and cry to Yahweh; Yahweh's deliverance of his people by "his mighty hand . . . with signs and wonders" (vv. 5b-8); and inheritance of the land (v. 9).⁸²

The Gattung of the entire book also reflects the importance of these traditions. Noting the importance of considering the present form of the book as the product of a community of faith, von Rad identifies a covenant form: Deut. 1-11, historical setting and parenetic exposition; Deut. 12-26, recitation of the law; Deut. 26:16-19, covenantal obligations; Deut. 27ff, blessings and curses.⁸³ The

⁸¹Cf. the study by Herbert Huffmon: "Exodus, Sinai and Credo," CBQ (April, 1965), pp. 101-13. Also Weiser, The Old Testament, pp. 88-89.

⁸²I find von Rad's arguments that these credos represent early, historical formulae quite convincing. He stresses the likelihood that reference to the Promised Land would appear in a harvest prayer. Nor is it likely that such a pericope--given its cultic appearance--would be simply invented. "Die feierliche Rezitation der Hauptdaten der Heilsgeschichte, sei es als direktes Credo oder als paränetische Rede an die Gemeinde, muss einen festen Bestandteil des altisraelitischen Kultus gebildet haben." von Rad, Das formgeschichtliche Problem, p. 7.

⁸³Ibid., pp. 27-28.

basis for the proclamation of the law is therefore the presentation of Heilsgeschichte, i.e., the consideration of Yahweh's past deeds for his people. As von Rad notes, Deut. 1-11 form-critically parallels Ex. 19; 20:1-2. Both constitute the prologue to proclamation of covenantal law.⁸⁴ The historical account in Deut. 1-3 basically narrates the wandering in the wilderness as recounted by Moses. Mention is made, however, of initial stages in the conquest (2:26-3:11), and the promise of the land is reiterated (3:12-22). Beyond this, references to the Heilsgeschichte occur frequently. Thus, Moses stresses Yahweh's gift of the land as the basis for purging the Canaanites within Israel's midst (7:1-5). In the same "sermon" the evidence that Yahweh is God and the basis for obedience to his commands (vv. 9-11) is his saving deed in delivering Israel from Egypt (v. 8). In a parallel oration⁸⁵ Israel is likewise urged not to forget the deliverance from Egypt (6:12).

References to the conquest are prevalent in the Deuteronomic passages concerning Holy War. The promise of the land and the process of its conquest form the context for the Deuteronomic theology of Holy War.⁸⁶ Von Rad has shown that the theology of Holy War permeates Deuteronomy,

⁸⁴Ibid., pp. 24-25.

⁸⁵A. Klostermann, Der Pentateuch (Leipzig, 1906), p. 246. Von Rad, "Problem," p. xxx.

⁸⁶Norman K. Gottwald, "'Holy War' in Deuteronomy: Analysis and Critique," Review and Expositor LXI (Fall, 1964), p. 303.

whether in the form of particular laws (e.g., 20:10-18; 21:10-14; 23:10-14), or in isolated references to defeat and extermination of the Canaanites (6:18; 7:1ff; 20:16ff), or in Holy War speeches.⁸⁷ In 20:1-6, Moses reminds the Israelites that they shall confront enemy nations much more numerous than they (v. 1), and he concludes by warning that the gift of the land is not because of Israel's righteousness but rather in spite of her stubbornness (v. 6). In the speech of chap. 20, Israel is urged not to fear, in spite of overwhelming odds. The basis for her trust in Yahweh is the reminder that Yahweh "brought you up out of the land of Egypt." In Moses' solemn speech in chap. 31, he urges Israel to "be strong and of good courage," for she shall indeed inherit the land promised to their fathers by Yahweh (31:1-8). Finally, numerous individual references occur either within the context of hortatory material in chaps. 5-11 or as basis for particular laws in chaps. 12-26. References to the conquest or the promise of the land include 6:3, 10-11; 11:10-12, 31; 12:1, 10; 27:3; recollections of the exodus include 5:6, 15; 8:14; 9:26; 11:3, 4; 13:10; 16:1, 3; 29:2, 16.

Significance of the prophet; his role in Israel. The emphasis upon prophecy and the exalted role of the prophet is often noted in discussions of the Elohist source.⁸⁸ Hölscher,

⁸⁷ von Rad, Studies, pp. 45-59.

⁸⁸ Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 174. Georg Fohrer, Einleitung in das alte Testament (Heidelberg, 1965), p. 170. Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 203-04. Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 113.

in discussing the basic religious orientation of E comments that

Die Vertreter dieser Geschichtsdeutung sind auch bei E die Profeten. . . . Durch den Mund dieser Profeten deutet E die Geschichte Israels als eine Geschichte menschlicher Sünde und daraus folgenden Unheils, göttlicher Gnade und Treue.⁸⁹

Numerous passages illustrate this: In Ex. 32, the people lapse into revelry and apostasy. Moses returns in great anger (v. 19), destroys the golden calf (v. 20), and orders the slaughter of about three thousand Israelites (vv. 25-29). Ex. 33:7-11 gives a careful description of Moses receiving the word of Yahweh in the tent of meeting. In Num. 14, the people "raise a loud cry" and propose to rebel (v. 4ff). Moses receives the terrible word of Yahweh that all will die in the wilderness (v. 33). He proclaims this to the people (v. 39ff).

In addition to Moses, Hölscher also speaks of Abraham (specifically called a prophet in Gen. 20:7), Miriam (cf. Ex. 15:20), Samuel, Nathan, Ahijah, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah as prophets who are prominent in the Elohist strand.⁹⁰ He refers, in the quotation given above, to the prophet in E as mediator of Yahweh's grace. This role (which I would identify as intercession) does not receive sufficient emphasis however. This is also true in

⁸⁹Hölscher, op. cit., p. 245.

⁹⁰In his study, Hölscher traces both the Elohist and Yahwist through II Kings.

Scharbert's study where he carefully reviews the various mediatorial roles of prophet, priest, judge, as well as major figures such as Moses, Joshua, and Samuel. In discussing the Elohist's portrayal of Moses, Scharbert stresses that Moses transmits Yahweh's word but does not function as intercessor for the people before Yahweh.⁹¹ The same is claimed for prophets, who do not function as intercessors prior to Jeremiah. "Die Hauptaufgabe des Propheten ist die Übermittlung des Gotteswortes, das, wie bereits betont wurde, zu allen Zeiten entweder Heils- oder Unheilswort sein konnte."⁹²

Numerous passages in the text indicate differently, however. E not only refers to Abraham as a prophet but links this concretely with his function as an intercessor: "Now then restore the man's wife; for he is a prophet, and he will pray for you (wytpll), and you shall live." (Gen. 20:7). Moses acts very often as intercessor on behalf of the people before Yahweh. In Ex. 14:10-18, the people are fearful before the Egyptians (v. 10a). Moses cries to Yahweh (s'q; v. 15), and Yahweh responds by delivering them (vv. 16-18). In Ex. 32, Moses again intercedes before Yahweh, pleading for forgiveness (vv. 30-32). This is one

⁹¹Josef Scharbert, Heilsmittler im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient (Freiburg, 1964), pp. 90-92.

⁹²Ibid., p. 286.

of the few instances where Moses' plea is in vain (vv. 33-35). In Num. 12, Miriam and Aaron incur Yahweh's wrath because they have slighted Moses. Yahweh's punishment is swift and terrible (v. 9ff). Moses intercedes, however, and presumably secures Miriam's recovery (vv. 13-15). At Mt. Hor, the people complain about the absence of food and water (21:5). In wrath Yahweh afflicts them with serpents (v. 6). The people repent of their lack of faith, and Moses prays for them (wytp11; v. 7b). This ensures Yahweh's forgiveness (vv. 8-9).

The most significant passage, however, for intercession as a function of the prophets in E is Ex. 20:18-20:

Now when all the people saw the thunderings and the lightnings and the sound of the trumpet and the mountain smoking, the people were afraid and trembled; and they stood afar off, and said to Moses, 'You speak to us, and we will hear; but let not God speak to us, lest we die.' And Moses said to the people, 'Do not fear; for God has come to prove you, and that the fear of him may be before your eyes, that you may not sin.

In a very illuminating monograph, Hans-Joachim Kraus discusses the position of one charged with proclamation of the apodictic law, whose context he assumes (with A. Alt) to be the covenant renewal festival.⁹³ Kraus identifies Ex. 20:18-20 as an etiological passage describing the Mosaic office of one who proclaims the covenant law ("Das Amt des charismatischen Rechtsverkünders. . ."). The reason for such an

⁹³Hans-Joachim Kraus, Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel (Theologische Studien, Heft LI), eds. Karl Barth and Max Geiger (Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1957).

office is expressly stated in v. 19. "Das Volk konnte die Heiligkeit und Herrlichkeit Jahwes nicht ertragen, darum erbat es einen menschlichen Mittler, der das Recht verkündete."⁹⁴ The juxtaposition of this passage with the decalogue and the Covenant Code suggests the probability of Kraus' thesis. Nevertheless the fear of the people before God permits the conclusion that Moses shall here function as an intercessor in the broader sense of one who will speak to God on the people's behalf. In summary, it would seem appropriate to accord an intercessory function to the prophets in the Elohist source.

As has been noted, Moses is the prophet par excellence in E; thus he is the only one who is able to speak directly with God (ph 'l ph, Num. 12:8). In addition, the spirit of prophecy is accorded to others, according to the Elohist. When Joshua protests that Eldad and Medad are claiming to prophesy, Moses admonishes, "Would that all Yahweh's people were prophets!" (Num. 11:29). Immediately preceding this event, Moses has gathered the elders about him that they may be prophets: wyhy knwh 'lyhm hrwh wytnb'w, "when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied." (Num. 11:25b)

I would conclude that the evidence presented "shows clearly a positive interest in and the close relationship of E to the prophetic movement."⁹⁵ As in E, so also in D.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 13.

⁹⁵Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 114.

does the prophet appear highly esteemed; and affinities with the prophetic movement are pronounced. This is expressed in several ways. S. R. Driver notes that Deuteronomy

combines the spirit of the prophet and the spirit of the legislator: it is a prophetical law-book, a law-book in which civil and ceremonial statutes become the expression of a great spiritual and moral ideal, which is designed to comprehend and govern the entire life of the community.⁹⁶

He does not specify, but presumably he speaks of D's emphasis upon complete and inward love of God and one's fellow man (e.g., 6:4-5 and 11:1). As did the prophets, so also Deuteronomy deals at great length with the problem of absolute loyalty to Yahweh and purity of worship in the face of Canaanite heathenism.⁹⁷

Perhaps most important, however, is the attention which Deuteronomy gives to the "office" of the prophet. Within a pericope which sets forth the offices of Israel, the pre-eminent position is accorded the prophet (Deut. 18:15ff), for which office Moses is the prototype. The author carefully (and climatically) contrasts the futile practices of soothsayers and sorcerers to the only one with whom Yahweh speaks directly--the prophet (18:17-18). Included in the brief passage (vv. 15-22) are the definition

⁹⁶S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy (International Critical Commentary; New York, 1895), pp. xxvi-xxvii.

⁹⁷McCarthy, op. cit., p. 118. Cf. also Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 133. J. A. Bewer, The Literature of the Old Testament (New York, 1938), p. 74.

of the office (15a), the divine ordination (18a, "I will raise up for them a prophet like you. . . .") and the warning against a false prophet (20a). Clearly the prophet in D is identical in importance and function with the prophet in E: Yahweh speaks directly with both (cf. Num. 12:8, E); Moses is the prophet par excellence (cf. Deut. 34:10); and perhaps most importantly, the "locus classicus" of the prophet's function in E (Ex. 20:18) is quoted here (v. 16).⁹⁸ It seems warranted to apply to both E and D the observation of von Rad:

. . . what stands unmistakably in the forefront in Deuteronomy is an interest in prophecy and the problems which it set. Indeed, the supreme office through which the proper intercourse between Jahweh and Israel is to be carried out is that of the prophet, who will never cease in Israel (Deut. xviii. 18). Thus, according to Deuteronomy, Israel as properly constituted stands explicitly under charismatic leadership.⁹⁹

Emphasis upon Moses. Another theme which E and D share is the position accorded to Moses. As I have noted, the greatest prophet is Moses. In both sources (cf. Num. 12:7, E and Deut. 5:26-27, D) God speaks face to face only with Moses. In the Elohist, Moses' position is given pre-eminence in numerous ways. His life marks the time when

⁹⁸Muilenburg, "Office," pp. 86-87. Cf. also Kraus, Die prophetische Verkündigung, pp. 13-16, where he speaks of this passage and Ex. 20:18ff as etiological passages for the "Mosaic office" of "charismatischer Übermittler des Gottesrechts."

⁹⁹Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, tr. D. M. G. Stalker (New York, 1962), tr. of Theologie des Alten Testaments, Bd. I, Munich, 1957), I, 99.

God first revealed His name to His people (Ex. 3). Not only is he the leader of Israel during the sojourn in Egypt, the exodus, and the wanderings in the wilderness; during this time, he alone is the worker of miracles. The plagues are not simply announced as in J but produced by Moses' magic rod (Ex. 7:20; 9:23; 10:12, 13a, 21ff). Other miraculous deeds include dividing the Sea of Reeds (Ex. 14:16), producing water from rock (Ex. 17:5ff), defeating Amalek by simply waving his hands (Ex. 17:8-13).¹⁰⁰ In addition to serving as intercessor on behalf of sinful Israel, Moses performs three other major functions: He mediates God's commands to the people and receives their pledges of obedience (Ex. 20:1-23:19; 24:3-11). He is the teacher of the Torah, making it public and interpreting it (Ex. 18:20, ". . . you shall teach them the statutes and the decisions, and make them know the way in which they must walk and what they must do.'). Finally, Moses is a judge, ruling over the major cases that cannot be delegated to others (Ex. 18:22, ". . . every great matter they shall bring to you, . . ."; cf. also Ex. 33:7-11).¹⁰¹

In Deuteronomy, Moses' role is considerably different, although no less prominent. His influence on events in Israel's history is minimized. Only rarely does he act as a leader directing Israel's fortunes (Deut. 1:23; 2:20ff;

¹⁰⁰Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 174.

¹⁰¹Scharbert, op. cit., pp. 91-92.

3:18), and he does not perform miracles. On the contrary his role is to proclaim God's word. The most significant aspect of the portrayal of Moses in Deuteronomy is that the book is cast as a speech by Israel's leader. This is unique among the law books of the Old Testament.¹⁰² As in E, Moses intercedes for the people. Moses recalls that Yahweh heard his plea after the sorry events of the golden calf (Deut. 9:19), and Aaron's life was spared through his intercessory offices (9:20). In this portion of Moses' description, much more is made of the burdens of his intercession than in other sources. We are told that he lies prostrate for forty days and nights and fasts (Deut. 9:18). His long prayer of intercession is given (Deut. 9:25ff). Furthermore, Moses is implicated in the apostasy of the people. Because of their sin, he will not see the Promised Land (Deut. 1:37; 3:24, 25). Thus, Moses as a "suffering mediator" of Yahweh is accentuated in D more than in E.¹⁰³

Use of the Covenant Gattung. Parallels between the Covenant Code and Deut. 12-26.

George Mendenhall's pioneering research established the Gattung of treaties: preamble and prologue; stipulations; provision for public reading and deposit; list of gods as witnesses; curses and blessings.¹⁰⁴ These findings have

¹⁰² von Rad, Theology, I, 294-95. Studies, p. 11.

¹⁰³ von Rad, Theology, I, 294.

¹⁰⁴ Mendenhall, op. cit., pp. 31-34. The study depends in part on the earlier research of V. Korošec, Hethitische Staatsverträge (Leipzig, 1931). I have not been able to see this work.

been applied to Old Testament texts with notable results. Thus, the Elohist account of the revelation at Sinai (Ex. 20-24) contains prologue (20:1-2), laws in apodictic form (20:3-23:19), and blessings and assurance of judgment if disobedience is encountered (23:19-23). In Ex. 24:7 provision is made for public reading of the "book of the covenant."¹⁰⁵

Other notable examples of the covenant Gattung in E include the account of the solemn assembly at Shechem (Jos. 24). On the one hand, the Gattung in this chapter is unusually close to that of the Hittite treaty: preamble (v. 2); Vorgeschichte (vv. 2-13; a lengthy review of past events between the contractual parties); stipulations (vv. 14-15); blessings and curses (implied in the statement of 24:20); inscription of the laws and invocation of witnesses (vv. 26-27).¹⁰⁶ Finally, the Gattung and the terminology of Ex. 19:3-6 are noteworthy. Again we see the familiar combination of recital of past events (v. 4) and the statement of obligations (vv. 5-6).

It is the language of direct address, of proclamation and urgent call to hearing, of stress upon the first and second persons, the I and the Thou, and above all of the covenant contingency with its protasis and

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 35ff. McCarthy, op. cit., pp. 153-54; note, however, McCarthy's reservations. Baltzer, op. cit., p. 610.

¹⁰⁶Baltzer, op. cit., pp. 29-36. Baltzer notes that any extensive series of obligations is missing, and the witnesses of other gods is not applicable. Cf. also McCarthy, op. cit., pp. 144-47.

apodosis, which lies at the heart of the message.¹⁰⁷

The connection between this covenant Gattung in Elohist passages and in the book of Deuteronomy is direct, as von Rad has shown.¹⁰⁸ The Gattung which he identifies in the book has been noted above (p. 160). A remarkably similar structure is evident in the Sinai traditions known to J and E (but primarily E): exhortation (Ex. 19:4-6) and historical prologue (Ex. 20:1); proclamation of the law (decatalogue and Covenant Code); promise of blessing (Ex. 23:20-33); sealing of the covenant (Ex. 24:3-11).

Die besondere geschichtliche Verkleidung dieser vier Grundelemente im Buch Exodus kann doch nicht darüber hinwegtäuschen, dass sich das Deuteronomium sowohl formal wie sachlich durchaus in derselben Festtradition bewegt.¹⁰⁹

The similarity of content to which von Rad calls attention has been often noted. Not only is the decatalogue repeated (Deut. 5:6-21), but numerous legal pericopes are contained alike in Deuteronomy and in the Covenant Code: treatment of slaves (Ex. 21:1-11; Deut. 15:12-18); cities of asylum (Ex. 21:12-14; Deut. 19:1-13); kidnapping (Ex. 21:16; Deut. 24:7); seduction (Ex. 22:16-17; Deut. 22:28, 29); charity to strangers, widows, orphans (Ex. 22:21-24; Deut. 24:17-22); usury (Ex. 22:25; Deut. 23:19-20);

¹⁰⁷Muilenburg, "Covenantal Formulations," p. 352.

¹⁰⁸von Rad, Studies, pp. 14-15; Das formgeschichtliche Problem, pp. 23ff.

¹⁰⁹von Rad, Das formgeschichtliche Problem, p. 25.

collateral in loans (Ex. 22:26ff; Deut. 24:10-13); first-born as sacrifice (Ex. 22:29ff; Deut. 15:19-23); unclean animals (Ex. 22:31; Deut. 14:3-21); malicious witnesses (Ex. 23:1; Deut. 19:16-21); conduct of judges (Ex. 23:2-3, 6-8; Deut. 16:18-20); aid to one's neighbor (Ex. 23:4-5; Deut. 22:1-4); year of release (Ex. 23:10-11; Deut. 15:1-11); Sabbath (Ex. 23:12; Deut. 5:13-15); oath taking (Ex. 23:13; Deut. 6:13); major festivals (Ex. 23:14-17; Deut. 16:1-17); first-fruits as sacrifice (Ex. 23:19a; Deut. 26:2-10); "you shall not boil a kid in its mother's milk" (Ex. 23:19b; Deut. 14:21b).¹¹⁰

The form and content of the laws in the Covenant Code and in Deuteronomy, as well as the Holiness Code, have been analysed by Rabast. His isolation of numerous units of apodictic law serves further to define the relationship of the two codes. Probably Deuteronomy was dependent upon the legal traditions underlying the Covenant Code. He expanded the laws in a homiletical manner. The social orientation is emphasized (Deut. 24:6, 14), and the theological concerns of the authors are prominent.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰Gerhard von Rad, Deuteronomy (The Old Testament Library; Philadelphia, 1966; tr. of Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium, Göttingen, 1964), p. 13.

¹¹¹"Der Deuteronomiker interpretiert das Recht des Bundesbuches in Beispielen und Motiven . . . Der Deuteronomiker 'predigt' über juristische Texte." Rabast, op. cit., pp. 8, 16-17; cf. also Driver, Deuteronomy, pp. viii-x.

Yahweh alone shall rule. The theme of Yahweh as king is most frequently associated with the period of the amphictyony. In Jud. 8:23, Gideon says "I will not rule over you, and my son will not rule over you; Yahweh will rule over you." This account follows on Gideon's spectacular victory on Israel's behalf. It is his response to the demand of the people to make him king.¹¹² That this theme is historical is suggested by the fact that Israel delayed for nearly two centuries before adopting the pattern of an earthly kingship. This phenomenon, which was the source of Israel's uniqueness during the period of the amphictyony, is closely related to her exclusive loyalty to Yahweh.

The exclusive commital of the sacred association of the Israelite tribes to its God and to his will have had its effect on their history, and the particularity of Israel thus appears as a historical fact.¹¹³

Hence, the "major" judges derive their authority not from the people nor is it inherited. Rather, they are instruments of Yahweh; their charisma is a "free gift of Yahweh."¹¹⁴ Jephthah is an exception to this policy (Jud. 11:1ff).

¹¹²The passage quoted from the account of Gideon is Elohist, as Eissfeldt has noted, because of its similarity with such passages as the sermon in 6:7-10 and the Abimelech episode (8:33-35; 9:5b-24, 56-57). Eissfeldt, Introduction p. 262.

¹¹³Noth, History, pp. 164-65. "God, King and Nation," The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, trs. D. R. Ap-Thomas (Edinburgh, 1966; tr. of Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, Munch, 1960), pp. 161ff.

¹¹⁴A. Alt, "The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, tr. R. A. Wilson (Oxford, 1966; tr. of "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina," Kleine Schriften II, München, 1959), p. 178.

The demand for exclusive loyalty to Yahweh was basic to the association of tribes prior to the beginning of the monarchy. In all probability their alliance with one another centered on worship at a common shrine.¹¹⁵ The theme of Yahweh's absolute pre-eminence as Israel's God and as her leader is perhaps most clearly revealed in the presentation of the "major" judges and in the closely related motif of holy war. A major, although not exclusive, theme in the accounts of the judges is that Yahweh acted decisively to deliver his people. The judges were called forth by Him, and He caused great panic among the enemy (Jud. 4:14; 7:21ff). The Israelites simply "came to help him." (Jud. 5:23). The account of Gideon and the systematic reduction of the troops carries the motif of Yahweh acting alone to its extreme (Jud. 7:2ff).¹¹⁶ This emphasis upon Yahweh is the sine qua non for the Holy War.¹¹⁷

Specific reference to Yahweh as king occurs several times in the Elohist, as for example in Ex. 15:18 where the Song of Miriam ends with the exultant cry, "Yahweh will reign (ymlk) for ever." The same theme is suggested by the parallelism of the last two lines in Num. 23:21:¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵Noth, Das System, pp. 94, 112ff.

¹¹⁶von Rad, Theology, I, 328ff.

¹¹⁷von Rad, Studies, p. 48.

¹¹⁸Here the question of source analysis is difficult; the passage may be JE, although Carpenter and Harford treat it as E. The Composition of the Hexateuch (London, 1902), p. 519.

He has not beheld misfortune in Jacob;
 nor has he seen trouble in Israel
 Yahweh their God is with them,
 and the shout of a king is among them.

The Jotham fable is particularly vehement and categorical in its denial of earthly kingship. The prophet bitterly denounces the Shechemites for making Abimelech king. Of the death of Abimelech it is said, "And God also made all the wickedness of the men of Shechem fall back upon their heads, and upon them came the curse of Jotham the son of Jerubba'al."¹¹⁹

In Deuteronomy, the theme of Yahweh's exclusive sovereignty over his people is also evident. Hence, the pre-eminent office in Deuteronomy's schema is that of the prophet, whose authority derives from Yahweh. He is "raised up" by Yahweh, and it is his words which the prophet speaks (Deut. 18:18-22). Furthermore, the prophet who speaks any but the words of Yahweh will die (Deut. 18:20). There is no categorical rejection of kingship, as in some Elohist passages, but the authors' opposition to the monarchy is evident from the negative content of the laws regarding kings (Deut. 17:16-17): the king shall not multiply horses for himself, nor wives, nor gold. According to the Deuteronomist the desire for a king has linked the people with the heathen nations (Deut. 17:14b). So complete is Deuteronomy's intent to portray the theocratic order of Israel's earliest period that it is surprising

¹¹⁹ von Rad, Theology, I, 60-61.

that such a pericope is admitted. It is not found in other law codes.¹²⁰ Alt discusses the meaning of this passage as it reflects the authors' reaction to kingship:

Er kann es nicht einfach verneinen, aber ebenso wenig uneingeschränkt bejahen; die Erfahrungen der Geschichte haben ihn gelehrt, dass seinem Ideal von dieser Institution her Gefahren drohen, gegen die er auf jeden Fall Vorsorge treffen muss, selbst um den Preis, dass dadurch die Institution jede Möglichkeit der Entfaltung ihres Wesens und schliesslich fast jede Daseinsberechtigung verliert.¹²¹

As in the Elohist, so also in Deuteronomy Yahweh's exclusive lordship over Israel is borne out in the ideology of the "holy war." As von Rad has shown, this institution and concept is prominent in Deuteronomy--both in individual legal pericopes and in lengthy sermons exhorting the people to faith and courage before their enemies. Thus, in Deut. 20:1-9, the first portion of the speech (vv. 1-4) stresses that Israel not fear, for it is Yahweh who goes forth to fight on Israel's behalf (v. 4). By putting panic in the hearts of the enemy, Yahweh will rout them (7:16-26; cf. especially vv. 21-23). Indeed courage in battle becomes a test of faith, for to fear is to doubt Yahweh's unfailing leadership: "It is Yahweh who goes before you; he will be with you, he will not fail you or forsake you; do not fear or be dismayed" (Deut. 31:8).

¹²⁰ von Rad, Deuteronomy, pp. 118-19.

¹²¹ A. Alt, "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums," Kleine Schriften (München, 1964; 3rd edition), II, 264.

A specific reference to Yahweh as king may be noted in the framework to the Blessing of Moses:

Thus Yahweh became king in Jeshurun,
when the heads of the people were gathered,
all the tribes of Israel together (Deut. 33:5).¹²²

The source which preserves this Blessing remains undetermined, however. Eissfeldt does not link it with either J or E. He notes that it "could be old and even very ancient indeed," judging from the parallels between the psalmic framework (vv. 1-5 and 26-29) and Judges 5.¹²³ The orthographic evidence in the Blessing suggests a date no later than the tenth century, due to the absence of final vowel letters in some cases.¹²⁴ Interestingly, this finds some agreement in Driver's suggestion in 1895 that the Blessing accords well with the reign of Jeroboam I (922-901).¹²⁵

Religious Orientation. A final area in which the Elohist and Deuteronomy have much in common is a primarily religious orientation, both in the historical narrative of the events of Israel's history and in legal material included in their literary deposits.

This attempt to spiritualize the coarse events of history and to elevate important figures in Israel's history to positions of unimpeachable righteousness has often

¹²²Cf., however, von Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 205, who denies a reference to Yahweh's kingship.

¹²³Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 228.

¹²⁴Frank Cross and D. N. Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," JBL LXVII (1948), pp. 191-210.

¹²⁵Driver, Deuteronomy, pp. 387-88.

been noted. Thus, Pfeiffer notes that in E questionable actions of the patriarchs are altered or justified as deriving from divine commands. Abraham did not actually lie about his relation to Sarah (Gen. 20:1-17). Sarah deals harshly with Hagar according to J (Gen. 16:6) but simply follows God's command in dismissing her according to the Elohist (Gen. 21:12). In E, Jacob gets the best of the herd by divine providence (Gen. 31:5-16), not by trickery as in J (Gen. 30:37-43).¹²⁶ Weiser remarks on the "theological ideology" of E, which emphasizes obedience to Yahweh (Ex. 20:3; Jos. 24:14).¹²⁷

E's concept of Israel before her God is well summarized in Ex. 19:6,

Now therefore, if you will obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my own possession among all peoples for all the earth is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.

This remarkable statement of obligation and promise illustrates three major themes of the Elohist: 1) a predominant ethical concern, made specific in the Covenant Code; 2) Israel's exclusiveness among the nations as the chosen of Yahweh; and 3) the primarily religious aspect of her existence. The latter receives prominent negative emphasis in E's portrayal of Israel's continual sin and God's inexorable judgment. Even ". . . the Horeb events echo with a sharp

¹²⁶Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 176.

¹²⁷Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 115.

note of dissonance."¹²⁸ As Moses is on the mountain receiving God's commands, the people are reveling around the golden calf. God's promise is clear--not only of a land to inherit but of a final and terrible judgment: "Now go, lead the people to the place of which I have spoken to you. See, my angel shall go before you, but in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them" (Ex. 32:34).¹²⁹

Even prior to Sinai, the people are disbelieving and impatient: at Marah (Ex. 15:24), at the wilderness of Sin (Ex. 16:1-3), and at Rephidim (Ex. 17:1-2). After the departure from Horeb during the wilderness wanderings, E highlights the "murmurings" and sins of the people and their leaders (Num. 12:1-16; 14:1; 17; 18). In Num. 14, the people propose open rebellion; Moses intercedes before Yahweh, who pardons them. However, the judgment is unwavering against those who have tested Him "these ten times and have not hearkened to my voice, . . ." They shall never see the land of Canaan (14:23).

At one point, the conquest of the land is thwarted by the sin of Achan, who took of the spoils of victory (the herem) for himself (Jos. 7:1-15). According to 7:1a, this act involved all Israel in guilt: "But the people of Israel broke faith in regard to the devoted things. . . ." Note

¹²⁸Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 202. Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 115.

¹²⁹Eissfeldt, loc. cit.

also that the same expression for Yahweh's anger (wyhr 'p yhwh) is used here (7:1b) as in the Elohist account of Ex. 32, with regard to Moses (wyhr 'p msh). Finally, in Jos. 24, Joshua presents a very sobering view of Israel's obedience to her God. The people insist (vv. 16-18) that they will be faithful, but Joshua counters by insisting that God's judgment is ever upon them: "You cannot serve Yahweh, for he is a holy God; he is a jealous God; he will not forgive your transgressions or your sins" (24:19).

The emphasis in E upon absolute obedience to Yahweh alone (Ex. 20:3; Jos. 24:14, 22) and at the same time upon Israel's failure to render such obedience leads Hölscher to identify a theological Geschichtsdeutung which provides the framework for E's narrative. He views the Elohist as posing the religious question, Why did the kingdom of Israel fall? The answer given by the Elohist: ". . . wegen seiner Untreue gegen Jahve und sein Gesetz."¹³⁰

When we turn to Deuteronomy, much the same concern and emphasis are apparent. Driver has summarized the impact of Deuteronomy:

. . . it is the expression of a profound ethical and religious spirit, which determines its character in every part. The author wrote, it is evident, under a keen sense of the perils of idolatry; and to guard Israel against this by insisting earnestly on the debt of gratitude and obedience which it owes to its Sovereign Lord, is the fundamental teaching of the book.¹³¹

¹³⁰Hölscher, op. cit., p. 243.

¹³¹Driver, Introduction, p. 77.

Israel is continually warned against following in the ways of "other gods" (Deut. 6:12-15; 7:4; 8:11-20; 11:16ff, 28; 17:1-7; 30:17). Throughout, she is addressed and exhorted to live a religious life. Thus, the command to worship in a central sanctuary, and only there, is prominent in several major sections: in the law of the altar, according to which Israel is to destroy all pagan altars and offer her sacrifices only at the designated sanctuary (12:1-7); in the law providing for a tithe "of your grain, your wine, your oil, and the firstlings of your flocks and herds" (14:22-29; cf. also 15:19-23); in the law establishing the festivals (16:1-7); in the law designating judges and priests to settle criminal cases (17:8-13); in the provisions for the Levite, who may "minister in the name of Yahweh his God" in the chosen place (18:1-8).¹³² In addition to these pericopes, chap. 26 deals with the procedure for offering the tithe; and numerous passages solemnly warn against apostasy, as noted above. It may be concluded that while the laws in Deuteronomy are by no means exclusively cultic, nevertheless a significant portion can be so designated.

The performance of these requirements, and others, which rest upon Israel center in the uncompromising demand of absolute loyalty to Yahweh. This basic motif is well illustrated in the most typical phraseology of a book which

¹³² von Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 16.

is characterized by its standardized expressions:

"to fear Yahweh" Deut. 4:10; 5:29; 6:24; 8:6; 10:12;
14:23; 17:19; 28:58; 31:13.

"keep my commandments" Deut. 4:2; 5:10; 11:1, 8, 22;
12:28; 13:4; 17:19; 26:17; 30:10, 16.

"walk in his ways" Deut. 8:6; 10:12; 11:22; 16:17;
19:9; 28:9; 30:16.

"hearken to the voice of Yahweh" Deut. 4:30; 5:22; 13:
19; 15:5; 26:14, 17; 27:10; 28:1, 2, 15, 45, 62.

"with all your heart and all your 'soul'" Deut. 4:29;
6:5; 10:12; 11:13; 13:3; 26:16; 30:2, 6, 10.

"serve Yahweh" Deut. 6:13; 10:12, 20; 11:13; 13:4;
28:47.

"serve other gods" Deut. 7:4; 8:19; 11:16; 13:2, 6,
13; 17:3; 28:14, 36, 64; 29:18, 26; 30:17.

Israel's failure to fulfill her covenant obligations from the very beginning is noted in Deuteronomy, although the theme is not as prominent as in E (cf. Deut. 9:7b, ". . . from the day you came out of the land of Egypt, until you came to this place, you have been rebellious against Yahweh.").

As in the Elohist, the nation Israel is portrayed in Deuteronomy as the exclusive possession of Yahweh her God; thus in Deut. 14:2 we read, "For you are a people holy to Yahweh your God, and Yahweh has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth" (cf. also 4:37; 7:6; 10:15; 14:2; 26:18). This exclusiveness of Israel takes a special form in the admonitions against any contact

with the Canaanites. Intermarriage is strictly prohibited (7:3ff) and of course the Canaanite places of worship are to be destroyed (7:5; 12:2ff).¹³³ In his final speech to Israel, Joshua, according to the Deuteronomist, warns against any interaction with other nations. If they fail to remain apart, Yahweh will surely ensnare and punish them by the hand of such foreign peoples (Jos. 23:6-7, 12-13). This motif of judgment in the event of failure to obey and trust in Yahweh is prominent in Deuteronomy. The very structure of the book includes formal curses (Deut. 27:1-26; 28:15ff), and in numerous instances the consequences of disobedience are clearly disaster for Israel (Deut. 6:10-15; 8:11-20; 11:16ff; 31:29).¹³⁴

3. Basic Themes in the Anti-Monarchical Source

In the foregoing discussion I have attempted to define those areas in which Deuteronomy and the Elohist have common interests and affinities. Major themes of "amphictyonic" theology are evident in both strands of tradition: the primacy of the exodus and conquest traditions, the importance of the prophet and especially Moses, the exemplar of that "office," and the milieu of covenant and covenant Gattung. All of these themes serve to connect the two northern circles of tradition intimately.

¹³³Driver, Deuteronomy, p. xxii.

¹³⁴Ibid.

When one undertakes to examine the Elohist source as a whole, fragmentary though it may be, and then turn to the Deuteronomic traditions, he can scarcely resist the impression that we are dealing with one and the same stream of sacral traditions, traditions which by and large center in the covenant and the complex of traditions associated with it.¹³⁵

With these common themes before us, we now turn to the anti-monarchical source in I Samuel 1-15--that series of passages variously linked with D and E by scholars. The fact that scholars have identified the anti-monarchical source with both D and E suggests that these passages contain much that is identifiable with both sources. The presence of these themes outlined above to a noteworthy degree would suggest that this narrative strand represents neither D nor E. Rather it is an antecedent of these sources, an early expression of those traditions which later emerge in D and E.

Exodus and Conquest Traditions. An important element in D and E is the recollection of Yahweh's saving deeds as the basis for proclamation of the law, either in exhortation or as prologue in the covenant Gattung. This representation occurs in 12:6-11, where Samuel gives a lengthy recital of exodus and conquest traditions. The Gattung is that of the covenant. The historical prologue is followed by the conditionals which form the basis of Yahweh's treaty with his people (vv. 14-15).¹³⁶ In addition to 12:6-11 numerous

¹³⁵Muilenburg, "Office," p. 82.

¹³⁶Muilenburg, "Covenantal Formulations," pp. 361-62; cf. also Weiser, Samuel, p. 84.

instances occur in which the memory of the Exodus is invoked: as the measure of the people's continuous apostasy (8:8), as the basis for convening the sacred assembly (10:18), and as the basis for compassion to the Kenites (15:6).

The importance of Gilgal as a sanctuary city has been noted. Here the sacred events of exodus and conquest were uniquely combined in the ritual crossing of the Jordan (Jos. 3-4). The connection of the ark with Gilgal in these chapters also suggests that this city was an important cult center at some point in Israel's history, probably between the age of Shechem, the oldest center of the amphictyony, and the time of Shiloh represented in I Sam. 1-3. That Gilgal replaced Shechem as a cult centre for the amphictyony may be indicated by Deut. 11:26ff in which Gilgal is strangely located near Gerizim and Ebal.¹³⁷ It may be that various cult sanctuaries existed concurrently with each other, however. It is clear "that in the tradition of I Samuel at any rate the high status of the cultic centre at Gilgal is presupposed."¹³⁸ Gilgal is by no means solely associated with opposition to the monarchy. In 11:14-15, Samuel leads the people in renewal of the kingdom at Gilgal. Nevertheless the traditions are much more prominent

¹³⁷Hans-Joachim Kraus, "Gilgal. Ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels," VT I (1951), 192-93.

¹³⁸Kraus, Worship, p. 164. "Gilgal," p. 199.

that connect this city with strong censure of the monarchy (13:7b-15; 15:12-13, 32-33). In the latter, Samuel is closely associated with Gilgal, as he is in 7:16 where Gilgal is one of the cities in his circuit as judge.

Significance of the prophet; his role in Israel. Samuel is referred to as a prophet only once in the traditions of I Samuel 1-15 (3:20).¹³⁹ In 3:19-21, the motifs of birth and call are joined, and the climax of the narrative is reached. Here Samuel's calling is realized as the one who proclaims the word of God. As a part of this event, the word of God is restored to Shiloh following the barren years under Eli and his sons when "the word of Yahweh was rare . . . there was no frequent vision" (3:1b). As successor to the house of Eli, the prophet Samuel occupies the central role in Israel's activities, both political and religious.¹⁴⁰ Thus, the subsequent role of Samuel is introduced. He soon functions as the one who offers sacrifices (7:9) and intercedes for the people (7:5ff; 12:19ff); as the one who leads Israel in victory (7:9-11) and as the proclaimer of sacred law (10:25a; 12:14ff; 15:22-23, 29). Samuel does not appear as one of the classical prophets. Indeed he is more closely

¹³⁹I Sam. 9:9, as an explanatory gloss, probably reflects the vantage point of a later editor and does not speak to the question of Samuel's role.

¹⁴⁰Murray Newman, "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, eds. Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson (New York, 1962), p. 89.

associated with the bands of ecstatic prophets, whose chief characteristic was their zeal for Yahweh (10:3ff; 19:18-25).¹⁴¹ Yet Samuel does appear very close to the prophetic office as revealed in E and D. He is the sole voice of Yahweh to the people. He receives Yahweh's commands and carries them through (8:7ff). Yahweh always hearkens to his bidding, as in 12:18, where he commands the thunder and lightning.¹⁴² With no one else does Yahweh speak directly.

The prophetic message of absolute obedience and complete, inward loyalty to Yahweh, which is at the heart of Moses' proclamation of the law in the Covenant Code and in Deuteronomy, is likewise consistently present in Samuel's proclamation to the people, as in 7:3 when he exhorts them to repentance and in 12:14ff where he sets forth the conditionals which are the basis of their covenant with God. Samuel reminds Saul in 15:22 that obedience, not sacrifice, is required of Yahweh--a view which anticipates the later, "classical" prophets.¹⁴³

Use of Covenant Gattung. Parallels in the Law. As discussed above (p. 170) the Gattung of the treaty is prominent in both

¹⁴¹Ibid., pp. 90-91.

¹⁴²Prophets Elijah and Elisha perform similar "miracles" (I Kgs. 18:36-38; II Kgs. 2:13-14; 6:18-23).

¹⁴³Albright, Samuel, p. 17. I cannot, however, accept Albright's theory that Samuel stood at the beginning of the prophetic movement in the sense of an opposition to priesthood and cult.

E and D. This is the form in which Yahweh's covenant with his people was remembered and proclaimed. The same Gattung can be identified in I Sam. 12, Samuel's speech to the king and the people. Verses 7-12 constitute the historical prologue in which Samuel recalls the Exodus from Egypt (v. 8) and the period of the Conquest (vv. 9-11). The historical prologue is followed by Samuel's exhortation and presentation of the covenant conditionals (vv. 13-15). This passage begins with the key word, with as the preceding section does (cf. v. 7). Finally there is Yahweh's great act and Samuel's intercession for the people. This event also is related to the covenant motif. The words of cultic presence, "And now present yourselves,"¹⁴³ as well as the call to witness, "See this great event, which Yahweh will perform before your eyes," are prominent elements in Jos. 24. The motif of witness occurs in Ex. 19:3-6 also.¹⁴⁴ The dynamic of the pericope is that of "cultic affirmation and cultic response" which is basic to the covenant structure.¹⁴⁵ Samuel rehearses the events of Israel's sacred history and places before them the command of loyalty to Yahweh. The people respond by confessing their sin in desiring a king (12:19).

¹⁴³Walter Harrelson, "Worship in Early Israel," Biblical Research III (1958), pp. 4-5.

¹⁴⁴Muilenburg, "Covenantal Formulations," pp. 360-64.

¹⁴⁵Ibid., p. 362.

The Covenant Code in E and the legal sections of Deuteronomy (chaps. 12-26) set forth numerous legal pericopes, some of which are identical. Two passages of the anti-monarchical source suggest affinities with this aspect of E and D. In 10:25a, Samuel solemnly proclaims the laws regarding the king, records them, and places them before Yahweh. This threefold practice of proclamation, inscription, and deposit--a final stage in treaty making--is explicitly referred to in Ex. 24:3-4, 7 as well as in Jos. 24:26. Similarly, in Deuteronomy it is provided that the law, written by Moses, be put at the side of the ark. It is to be read aloud at the Feast of Booths every seven years (Deut. 31:9-13, 24-29).¹⁴⁶ This provision for deposit of the law is clearly continued in the Samuel tradition. The closest parallel to Samuel's action and instruction, however, would appear to be contained in Deut. 17:14-20, the provision for the office of the king. Following a reluctant recognition of the existence of kingship in Israel, the author lists prohibitions for the king (vv. 16-17). Then follows a provision for the recording and faithful reading of "this law" (vv. 17-18), in order that he shall "fear Yahweh his God" and not turn aside from any

¹⁴⁶ von Rad, Studies, p. 40. Von Rad notes that the connection with the ark, as the receptacle for the law, is a de-mythologization of its original meaning as signifying the presence of Yahweh (as in the ark traditions of I Sam. 4-6). Cf. also Adam C. Welch, Deuteronomy. The Framework to the Code (London, 1932), pp. 62-66.

commandment (vv. 19-20). Rabast has reduced the statements of vv. 16-17 to a series of apodictic laws.¹⁴⁷ These, it might be suggested, are then referred to in v. 18 or possibly constitute the duties of the king recorded according to I Sam. 10:25a.

It seems more likely, however, that "this law" in Deut. 17:18 refers to the entire corpus of Deuteronomic law, since the phrase is used in this way elsewhere (cf. Deut. 4:8; 27:3, 8, 26; 28:58, 61; 29:28; 31:9, 11, 12, 24).¹⁴⁸ It would be expected that the law to which the king is subject, both here and in the Samuel passage, would be more inclusive than vv. 16-17 and in part a positive statement with regard to his conduct. The king is subject to the same laws as all Israelites, "that his heart may not be lifted up above his brethren. . . ." (v. 20a).¹⁴⁹ The same criticism applies to seeing in 10:25a a reference to the list of practices of kings in 8:11-18.¹⁵⁰ Weiser characterizes the type of law referred to in 10:25:

. . . in 10, 25 dagegen ist ein am Jahweheiligtum deponiertes Rechtsdokument gemeint, das aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach die Belange des israelitischen Königs unter dem Gesichtspunkt des Herrschaftsanspruchs Jahwes im Sinn einer positiven Ordnung

¹⁴⁷Rabast, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

¹⁴⁸Driver, Deuteronomy, pp. 8, 212.

¹⁴⁹Noth, "God, King, and Nation," pp. 165-66. C. R. North, "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," ZAW L (1932), 36.

¹⁵⁰Smith, op. cit., p. 74.

geregelt hat.¹⁵¹

The motif that the king is subject to Yahweh's sovereignty and His law is equally expressed in Deuteronomy and in the passage before us.

In 12:3, Samuel protests his innocence¹⁵² and defends his faithful execution of his "office." Weiser has shown that the background and basis of these questions which Samuel puts to the people are specific laws in the Covenant Code.¹⁵³ Significantly these laws are also found in Deuteronomy:

<u>Covenant Code</u>	<u>I Sam. 12</u>	<u>Deuteronomy</u>
Ex. 20:17, "You shall not covet....his ox, his ass, or anything that is your neighbor's."	Prohibition against stealing livestock.	Deut. 5:21, "...neither shall you covet....his ox, his ass, or anything that is your neighbor's."
Ex. 22:20-21, "You shall not afflict nor oppress a sojourner for you were sojourners in the land of Egypt. You shall not afflict a widow or orphan."	Prohibition against extortion and oppression.	Deut. 24:17, "You shall not pervert the justice due to the sojourner or to the fatherless, or take a widow's garment in pledge."

¹⁵¹Weiser, Samuel, p. 67.

¹⁵²The Gattung for such a protest is established in similar pericopes extending into New Testament times (cf. for example Deut. 26:13-14, Test. of Issachar 7:2-6, and I. Cor. 13:4-7). A series of statements designed to be comprehensive, such a protest or "confession" was originally in the first person and negatively stated (cf. the affirmative form in Job 31:16-18). Gerhard von Rad, "The Early History of the Form-Category of I Corinthians XIII. 4-7," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, pp. 301-17.

¹⁵³Weiser, Samuel, p. 83.

<u>Covenant Code</u>	<u>I. Sam. 12</u>	<u>Deuteronomy</u>
Ex. 23:8, "And you shall take no bribe, for a bribe blinds the officials, and subverts the cause of those who are in the right."	Prohibition against receiving bribes.	Deut. 16:19, "...and you shall not take a bribe, for a bribe blinds the eyes of the wise and subverts the cause of the righteous."

In these ways the legal traditions embodied in E and D are also reflected in the anti-monarchical source of I Samuel 1-15.

Yahweh alone shall rule. The theme that the king is subject to the sacred law established and proclaimed by Samuel is closely related to the motif that Yahweh alone is sovereign in Israel. The basis of the opposition to the monarchy is that in raising up a king, the people have rejected Yahweh, who is already their king. This is expressly stated in 8:7, where Yahweh reminds Samuel that it is He whom the people ignore and reject. In the theocratic ideology of the pre-monarchical period, Yahweh alone is the ruler and redeemer for Israel. This is clear in the account of the conquest and in the role of the judges, as recalled in 12:11, "And Yahweh sent Jerubba'al and Barak, and Jephthah, and Samuel, and delivered you out of the hand of your enemies on every side; and you dwelt in safety." Not only has Yahweh sent these leaders but also the victory is his. It could not be attributed to those who were merely his instruments. Significantly, the demand for a king in the passages before us is consistently portrayed in contrast to the all-sufficiency

of Yahweh's acts, in order to emphasize, I believe, that kingship runs counter to this tenet of amphictyonic theology.

In 10:19 we read,

But you have this day rejected your God, who saves you from all your calamities and your distresses; and you have said, 'No! but set a king over us.'

The same phrase occurs in 12:6-12 where deliverance sent by Yahweh through his judges is immediately followed by the act of rejection promoted by the people.

The belief in Yahweh's absolute sovereignty is central to the theology of the Holy War. The institution of Holy War is virtually unique to the pre-monarchical period, in all probability because of the incompatibility of the concept with the monarchy where an earthly king was Israel's leader.¹⁵⁴ Beginning with Saul and David no king applied the law of herem. David exterminates the Geshurites, Girzites and Amalekites not because of herem but because he fears that Achish will learn of his forays (27:9-12). In the battles with the Amalekites (I Sam. 27 and 30) no mention is made of the command to exterminate Amalek (Deut. 25:17-19). Although Josiah pursued a cultic purification of the land no word is mentioned of devoting any pagan or foreign population.¹⁵⁵ Even in the pre-monarchical period the central concept of herem, which demanded the extermination of the Canaanite population and the Amalekites (Deut.

¹⁵⁴von Rad, Studies, pp. 45-46.

¹⁵⁵Gottwald, op. cit., pp. 299, 306.

20:10-18; 25:17-19), was not consistently applied, however. Not only is the narrative of Achan's failure (Jos. 7) preserved but also the Deuteronomist acknowledges the impossibility of exterminating all Canaanites when he claims that God left some to test Israel's faith (Jud. 2:20-23). Furthermore, immediate extermination would reduce the land to wilderness (Deut. 7:22). In view of the discrepancy between actual practice and the Deuteronomic demand for herem, Gottwald suggests that the Deuteronomist has elevated an occasional practice to the level of a dogmatic ideal. If Israel had been faithful to Yahweh, she would have practiced herem and avoided the contamination of association with the Canaanites.¹⁵⁶

It is this religious "ideal" that forms the issue in I Sam. 15. Saul presents himself as faithful to Yahweh (v. 13) when he meets Samuel. Yet he has failed in a basic responsibility. His soldiers have spared Agag from death (15:20). Not only does Samuel act to carry out the command of Yahweh that all survivors of war be devoted (vv. 32-35). He also rebukes Saul severely: "Because you have rejected the word of Yahweh, he has also rejected you from being king" (v. 23b). The severity of this rebuke is illustrative of the import of Saul's deed. By refusing to consecrate all the spoil of the battle to Yahweh, the king fails to acknowledge Yahweh's sovereignty. The act is a rejection of Yahweh

¹⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 304-05.

comparable to that of the people in demanding a king initially.

The immediate issue in this chapter is not the same as in the narratives which recorded events prior to the choice of a king. No longer is it meaningful to discuss whether or not to have a king. The basic issue remains the same, however: Yahweh's kingship or his absolute sovereignty and the demand for loyalty to Him. Here it is expressed in the controversy over observance of the ban. The kingship, in order to be acceptable, must acknowledge the uncompromising nature of the religious demand. It must protect the purity of Yahwistic faith against the pressure of popular desire and caprice (15:14-15).¹⁵⁷ The central theme of amphictyonic theology that Yahweh is king is thus evident in these passages of I Samuel. It will be recalled that this theme was prominent in E and especially in D within the ideology of Holy War.

Religious Orientation. The similarity of the passages before us to both E and D is noticeable in the tone of the passages. Throughout there is a consistent religious orientation and a spiritualization of events. This is illustrated in the description of events leading to the establishment of the monarchy. Whereas in other chapters this singular event in Israel's history is linked to external phenomena--the

¹⁵⁷Weiser, "I Samuel 15," pp. 23-25.

threat of Philistine occupation (9:15ff) or perhaps the (probably early) incident of the Ammonite attack (chap. 11) --in the anti-monarchical source it appears as the arbitrary desire of the people, who simply want to be as other nations. The demand is a reflection on their faith in Yahweh, for they have rejected him in setting over themselves a king. Accordingly Samuel requires that they confess their sin (12:19).¹⁵⁸

In these passages the center of attention is upon the man who is Israel's religious leader and sole intercessor before Yahweh: Samuel, who is prophet, priest, and judge. The opening chapters narrate the portentous events surrounding his birth and call. Not only does he replace the house of Eli, but he re-establishes the role of Shiloh as a cult center (3:21). Samuel is responsible for the defeat of the Philistines, who are vanquished completely from the land (7:13-14). Of equal significance is Samuel's role in the selection of a king. It is clearly Samuel's function to sit in judgment over the king (10:25a; 12:13-25). He specifically rebukes the king for failing to practice herem. Not only is the central figure the theocratic ruler of Israel; also "die Geschichtsauffassung ist durch und durch von theokratischer Theorie beherrscht, . . ." ¹⁵⁹

The basic motif of this theocratic view is the

¹⁵⁸Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, p. 172.

¹⁵⁹Ibid., p. 209.

command to obey and worship Yahweh alone. This norm, exactly paralleled in D (Deut. 5:6; 10:12; 11:8ff) and E (Ex. 20:3; Jos. 24:14), is central to Samuel's proclamation to the people and to the king. Thus in 7:3 Samuel makes clear the basis for any deliverance from Philistine threat:

If you are returning to Yahweh with all your heart, then put away the foreign gods and the Ashtaroth from among you, and direct your heart to Yahweh, and serve him only, and he will deliver you out of the hand of the Philistines.

In his final speech to the nation, Samuel expresses the same maxim. The covenant conditional that follows immediately upon the recital of the saving acts of Yahweh makes clear the obligation which rests on king and people alike:

If you will fear Yahweh and serve him and hearken to his voice . . . and if both you and the king who reigns over you will follow Yahweh your God, it will be well. . . ." (12:14)

This he repeats in 12:20, after the people have pleaded that he intercede on their behalf: "Fear not; you have done all this evil, yet do not turn aside from following Yahweh, but serve Yahweh with all your heart; . . ." This command, although based upon the saving deeds of Yahweh in Israel's history, nevertheless is never heeded. Israel has forsaken her Lord from the time of the Exodus to the present (8:8). Her sinfulness is unending (12:10, 19). This portrayal of the people in their covenant relation with Yahweh is the same as found in E and D.

4. Key Words and Phrases

The preceding discussion has served to suggest that certain basic themes in the anti-monarchical source of I Sam. 1-15 are prominent in both the Elohist source and in Deuteronomy. This indicates part of the reason that scholars have assigned these passages to D on the one hand and to E on the other. A similar conclusion is suggested if one surveys various key words and phrases in these passages. In the lists below,¹⁶⁰ the terms distinctive of E are listed (by chapter), then those belonging to D, and finally those terms common to both.

Birth and Call of Samuel (1:1-28; 2:11-26; 3:1-21)

- 1) hnnny ("Here I am") 3:4, 5, 6, 8, 16.
Gen. 22:11, 17; 27:1b, 18a; 31:11; 36:13b; 46:2;
Ex. 3:4; Num. 14:40.

Samuel and the Philistines (7:3-17)

- 2) hsyrw 't-'lhy hnkr ("put away the foreign gods") 7:3.
Gen. 35:2, 4; Jos. 24:20, 23.
- 3) hkynw lbbkm 'l-yhwh ("direct your heart to Yahweh") 7:3.
Unique; however, Jos. 24:23 is analogous: whw 't-lbbkm 'l-yhwh ("incline your hearts to Yahweh").

Demand for a King (8:1-22)

- 4) m'sw ("they have rejected" - of Yahweh as king) 8:7.
(Num. 11:20; 14:31.

¹⁶⁰The following lists are based in part upon the tabulations in Carpenter and Harford, op. cit., pp. 384-425.

- 5) h'lty...mmsrym ("I brought (them) out of Egypt") 8:8.
Ex. 17:3; 23:7; 32:1, 7, 23; 33:1; Num. 21:5; Jos.
24:32.

Choice of a King (10:17-21ab, 25a).

- 6) h'lyty...mmsrym ("I brought (Israel) out of Egypt")
10:18. Repeat; cf. #5.
7) m'stm ("you have rejected" - of Yahweh as king)
10:19. Repeat; cf. #4.

Samuel's Speech (12:1-25).

- 8) hnny ("Behold! Here I am") 12:3. Repeat; cf. #1.
9) h'lh...m'rs msrym ("who brought (your fathers) out
of the land of Egypt") 12:6. Repeat; cf. #5.

Rejection of Saul (15:4-8, 12-14, 20-23, 29-30a, 31a, 32-34).

- 10) b'lwt msrym ("when you came up out of Egypt") 15:2.
Repeat; cf. #5.
11) wym'sk ("you have rejected" - of Yahweh as king)
15:23, 26. Repeat; cf. #4.

The following terms are distinctive of D and are found in
the chapters of the anti-monarchical source as noted:

Birth and Call of Samuel (1:1-28; 2:11-26; 3:1-21).

- 12) t'skh ("forget") 1:11.
Deut. 4:9, 23, 31; 6:12; 8:11, 14, 19; 24:19; 25:
19; 26:13; 31:21; 32:18.
13) 'nky ("I") 1:28.
Deut. 5:6, 9; 12:30; 29:5; etc. (over 50 times).

Samuel and the Philistines (7:3-17).

- 14) bkl-lbbkm ("with all your heart") 7:3.
Deut. 4:29; 10:12; 11:13; 13:4; 26:16. Cf. Gen. 20:6 (E).
- 15) kl-yšr'l ("all Israel") 7:5.
Deut. 1:1; 5:1; 11:6; 13:11; 18:6; 21:21; 27:9;
28:61; 31:1, 7, 9, 11; 32:45; 34:12.
- 16) yd-yhwh ("hand of Yahweh") 7:13.
Deut. 2:15; 17:7; Jud. 2:15.¹⁶¹

Interestingly, two phrases that are highly characteristic of D, are avoided: 'rwn bryt yhwh (instead 'rwn yhwh is used) and 'lhym 'brym (instead 'lhy hnkr is used).

Demand for a King (8:1-22).

- 17) hlkw...bdrkw ("walk...in his way") 8:3, 5.
Deut. 1:31; 5:30; 8:6; 10:12; 11:22; 19:9; 26:17;
28:9; 30:16.
- 18) h'd t'yd ("you shall testify") 8:9.
Occurrences of the verb: Deut. 4:26; 8:19; 30:19;
32:46; cf. Ex. 21:29 (E).
- 19) wy'bdw 'lhym 'brym ("they served other gods") 8:8.
Deut. 7:4; 8:19; 11:16; 13:3, 7, 14; 17:3; 28:14,
36, 64; 30:17; cf. Ex. 23:25; Jos. 24:2, 16 (E).
The verb itself is characteristic of both D and E
(see below, p. 208).

¹⁶¹This phrase also appears in I Sam. 5:6, 9.

Choice of a King (10:17-21ab, 25a).

- 20) 'nky ("I") 10:18. Repeat; cf. #13.
 21) lšbtykm ("according to your tribes") 10:19.
 Deut. 1:13, 15; cf. also Jos. 23:4.
 22) wyktb bspr ("and he wrote in the book") 10:25.
 Deut. 28:58; 29:20, 26; 30:10.

Samuel's Speech (12:1-25).

- 23) kl-yšr'l 12:1. Repeat; cf. #15.
 24) 'šr-'šh ("which he did" - of Yahweh) 12:7b.
 Deut. 1:30; 11:3; 24:9; 29:2.
 25) wywsy'w...mmsrym ("brought (your fathers) out of Egypt") 12:8.
 Deut. 1:27; 4:20, 37; 5:6, 15; 6:12, 21, 23; 7:8, 19; 8:14; 9:12, 26, 28; 13:5, 10; 16:1; 26:8; 29:25. Cf. Ex. 20:2; Jos. 24:5 (E).
 26) škh ("forgot") 12:9. Repeat; cf. #12.
 27) yhwh 'lhykm ("Yahweh your God") 12:12, 14.
 Deut. 1:10, 26, 30, 32; 3:18, 20, 21, 22; 4:2, 4, 23, 34; 5:29, 30; 6:1, 16, 17; 8:20; 9:16; 10:17; 11:2, 13, 22, 25, 27, 28; 12:4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12; 13:4, 5, 6; 14:1; 20:4, 18; 29:5, 9; 31:12, 13, 26. Cf. Ex. 8:24; 10:8, 16, 17; 23:25 (E).
 28) mrytm 't-py yhwh ("you rebel against the commandment of Yahweh") 12:15.
 Deut. 1:26, 43; 9:7, 23, 24; 21:18, 20; 31:27.

- 29) tšm'w bqwl yhwh ("obey the voice of Yahweh") 12:15.
Deut. 4:30; 5:22; 8:20; 9:2, 23; 13:19; 15:5; 26:14,
17; 27:10; 28:1, 2, 15, 45, 62; 30:2, 8, 10, 20.
Cf. Ex. 15:26; 19:5 (E).
- 30) yd yhwh ("the hand of Yahweh") 12:15. Repeat; cf.
#16.
- 31) l'ynykm ("before your eyes") 12:16.
Deut. 1:30; 9:17; 29:1.
- 32) tswrw m'hry yhwh ("turn from following Yahweh") 12:20.
Deut. 5:29; 7:14; 9:12, 16; 11:16, 28; 17:11, 20;
28:14; 31:29.¹⁶²
- 33) bkl-lbbkm ("with all your heart") 12:20. Repeat;
cf. #14.
- 34) 'nky ("I") 12:23. Repeat; cf. #13.
- 35) w'bdm 'tw...bkl lbbkm ("serve him...with all your
heart") 12:24.
Deut. 10:12; 11:13; 28:47.

Rejection of Saul (15:4-8, 12-14, 20-23, 29-30a, 31a, 32-34).

- 36) hhrym ("were devoted") 15:8, 20.
Verb forms: Deut. 2:34; 3:6; 7:2; 13:16; 20:17.
- 37) šm'ty bqwl yhwh ("obey the voice of Yahweh") 15:20.
Repeat; cf. #29.
- 38) lyhwh 'lhyk ("to Yahweh, your God") 15:21.
Deut. 1:21, 31; 2:7, 30; 4:3, 10, 19, 21, 24, 25,

¹⁶²None of these exactly parallels the phrase in I Samuel, but all use swr in context of man's apostasy (either a declarative sense or a negative command).

29, 30, 31, 40; 5:6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16; 6:2, 5, 10, 13, 15; 7:1, 2, 6, 9, 12, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25; 8:2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19; 9:3, 4, 5, 6, 7; 10:9, 12, 14, 20, 21, 22; 11:1, 12, 29; 12:7, 15, 18, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 31; 13:6, 11, 13, 17, 19; 14:2, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29; 15:4, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21; 16:1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22; 17:1, 2, 8, 12, 15; 19:1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 14; 20:1, 13, 14, 16, 17; 21:1, 5, 10, 23; 22:5; 23:6, 15, 19, 21, 22, 24; 24:4, 9, 13, 18, 19; 25:16, 19; 26:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 16, 19; 27:3, 5, 6, 9, 10; 28:1, 2, 9, 13, 15, 45, 47, 52, 53, 58; 29:11; 30:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 20; 31:3, 6, 11.

A large number of terms can be listed under either D or E because they occur with notable frequency in both sources.¹⁶³ A listing of such terms is set forth below, with the occurrences in E and D indicated. This evidence suggests the extent to which the sources are related to one another.

Birth and Call of Samuel (1:1-28; 2:11-26; 3:1-21).

39) lzbh ("to sacrifice") 1:3, 4.

D: Deut. 12:15, 21; 15:21; 16:2, 4, 5, 6; 17:1; 18:3; 27:7.

¹⁶³I define a term as being common to both if it occurs a ratio of at least four to one in the sources.

E: Gen. 31:54; 46:1; Ex. 20:24; 22:19; 23:18;
24:5; 32:8; Num. 22:40.

40) lhšthwt ("to worship") 1:3, 19, 28.

D: Deut. 4:19; 5:9; 8:19; 11:16; 26:10; 29:25;
30:17; Jos. 23:7, 16.

E: Gen. 22:5; 37:7, 9, 10; 42:6; 48:12; Ex. 11:
8; 18:7; 20:5; 23:24; 32:8; 33:10.

41) wtpll ("she prayed") 1:10, 12, 26, 27; 2:25.

D: Deut. 9:20, 26.

E: Gen. 20:7, 17; Num. 11:2; 21:7.

42) ndr ("a vow"; noun form) 1:11, 21.

D: Deut. 12:6, 11, 17, 26; 23:19, 22.

E: Gen. 28:30; 31:13.

43) 'mt ("handmaid") 1:11, 16, 18.

D: Deut. 5:14, 18; 12:12, 18; 15:17; 16:11, 14.

E: Gen. 20:17; 21:10, 12, 13; 31:33; Ex. 2:5;
20:10, 17; 21:7, 20, 26, 27.

44) wkrtny ("remember me") 1:11, 19.

D: Deut. 5:15; 7:18; 8:2, 18; 9:7, 27; 15:15;
16:3, 12; 24:9, 18, 22; 25:17, 19; 32:7, 26;
Jos. 23:7.

E: Gen. 30:22; 40:14, 23; 41:9; 42:9; Ex. 2:24;
3:15; 20:8, 24; 23:13; 32:13; Num. 11:5.

45) mšrt ("was ministering") 2:11, 18; 3:1.

D: Deut. 10:8; 17:12; 18:5, 7; 21:5.

E: Gen. 40:4; Ex. 33:11; Num. 11:28.

46) kl h'm ("all the people") 2:23.

D: Deut. 27:15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23,
24, 25, 26; 20:11.

E: Gen. 35:6; Ex. 18:21; 19:11, 16, 25; 23:27;
24:3; 32:3; 33:8, 10; Num. 11:11, 12, 13, 14;
32:15; Jos. 24:2, 27.

47) yht' ("(if a man) sins") 2:25.

D: Deut. 1:41; 9:16, 18, 27; 15:9; 19:15; 20:18;
21:22; 22:26; 23:22, 23; 24:4, 15.

E: Gen. 20:6; 31:39; 40:1; 42:22; Ex. 20:20; 23:
33; 32:21, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34; Num. 12:11;
14:40; 21:7; 22:34; 32:23.

48) dbr-yhwh ("the word of Yahweh") 3:1, 7, 21.

D: Deut. 5:5.

E: Gen. 15:1, 4.

49) qr't ("you called") 3:5, 6, 8.

D: Deut. 2:11, 20; 3:9, 13, 14; 4:7; 5:1; 15:2,
9; 17:19; 20:10; 25:8; 28:10; 29:1; 31:7, 11;
32:3; 33:19.

E: Gen. 12:8, 18; 20:8, 9; 21:17, 31; 22:11, 14;
30:6, 8, 18, 20, 21; 31:4, 47; 33:20; 35:18;
41:8, 14, 43, 45, 51, 52; 45:1; 48:16. Ex. 1:
18; 2:7, 8, 10, 20, 22; 3:4; 7:11; 8:4, 21;
9:27; 10:16, 24; 12:31; 17:7; 19:3, 7, 20; 21:
12; 24:7; 32:5. Num. 11:34; 12:5; 13:16; 22:5,
30, 37; 24:10; 32:38, 41, 42; Jos. 24:1, 9.

50) spt ("I judge") 3:13.

D: Deut. 1:16; 16:18; 25:1.

E: Gen. 16:5; Ex. 2:14; 18:13.

51) mr'h ("the vision") 3:15.

D: Deut. 28:34, 67.

E: Gen. 12:11; 29:17; 41:2, 4, 21; Num. 12:6, 8
(amended).

52) nby' ("a prophet") 3:20.

As verb or noun:

D: Deut. 13:1, 3, 5; 18:15, 18, 20a, 22; 34:10.

E: Gen. 20:7; Ex. 15:20; Num. 11:25, 26, 27, 29;
12:6.

Samuel and the Philistines (7:3-17).

53) w'bdhw ("serve him" - of Yahweh) 7:3, 4.

D: Deut. 6:13; 10:20; 13:5.

E: Ex. 3:12; 10:11, 26; 12:31; 23:25; Jos. 24:14,
15, 21, 24, 31.

54) wysl...myd ("he delivered (you) from the hand of"
+ oppressor) 7:3.

D: Ex. 2:19; Deut. 25:11.

E: Gen. 37:21, 22; Ex. 3:8; 18:9, 10.

55) 'tpll b'dkm ("I will pray for you") 7:5. Repeat;
cf. #41.

56) ht'nw ("we have sinned") 7:6. Repeat; cf. #47.

57) bywm hhw' ("on that day") 7:6, 10.

D: Deut. 21:23; 27:11; 31:17, 18, 22.

E: Gen. 15:18; 48:20; Ex. 32:28.

58) 'l-yhwh 'lhynw ("Yahweh our God") 7:8.

D: Deut. 1:6, 19, 20, 25, 41; 2:19, 33, 36, 37;
3:3; 4:7; 5:2, 21, 22, 24; 6:4, 20, 24, 25;
29:14, 17, 28.

E: Ex. 3:18; 5:3; 8:6, 22, 23; 10:25, 26; Jos.
24:17, 18, 24.

59) y'lh(w) 'wlh ("he offered an offering") 7:9, 10.

D: Deut. 12:13, 14; 27:6.

E: Gen. 22:2, 13; Ex. 24:5; 32:6. Also of E but
no mention of an offering: Num. 23:2, 4, 14,
30.

60) wbyn h'mry ("and the Amorites") 7:14.

D: Deut. 1:7, 19, 27, 44; 3:9.

E: Gen. 15:16; 48:22; Ex. 23:23; Num. 13:29; 21:
13, 21; Jos. 24:11, 12, 15, 18.

61) wyšpt ("and he judged") 7:15, 16. Repeat, #50.

Demand for a King (8:1-22).

62) wytqbsw ("gathered") 8:4.

D: Deut. 13:17; 30:3, 4.

E: Gen. 41:35, 48.

63) lšptnw ("to judge us") 8:6, 20. Repeat; cf. #50.

64) wytpll ("he prayed") 8:6. Repeat; cf. #41.

65) wy'bdw ("they served") 8:8. Repeat; cf. #53.

66) wy'zbny ("they forsook me") 8:8.

D: Deut. 12:19; 14:27; 28:20; 29:24; 31:6, 8, 16,
17; 32:36.

E: Ex. 9:21; 23:5; Jos. 24:20.

67) bywm hhw' ("on that day") 8:18. Repeat; cf. #57.

68) šm' bqwlm ("hear their voice") 8:22.

D: Deut. 1:45; 4:30; 8:20; 9:23; 13:5; 15:5; 21:18, 20; 26:14, 17; 27:10; 28:1, 45, 62; 30:2, 8, 20.

E: Gen. 21:12; 30:6; Ex. 18:19; 19:5; 23:21, 22; Jos. 24:24. These are instances of verb šm' plus bqwl with suffix or genitive of possession.

Choice of a King (10:17-21ab, 25a).

69) bny-yšr'l ("sons of Israel") 10:18.

D: Deut. 1:3; 3:18; 4:44, 45; 28:69; 31:19, 22; 32:8; 34:8.

E: Gen. 45:21; 46:5; Ex. 3:9, 10, 11, 13; 13:18; 24:5; 32:20; 33:5; Num. 13:24; 20:19; 32:9.

70) htysbw ("present yourselves") 10:19.

D: Deut. 7:24; 9:2; 11:25; 31:14.

E: Ex. 19:17; Num. 11:16; 23:3, 15; Jos. 24:1.

71) šbt(y) ("tribe") 10:20.

D: Deut. 1:23; 3:13; 10:8; 18:1; 29:7, 17, 20; 33:5.

E: Ex. 24:4; Num. 24:17; 32:33; Jos. 24:1.

Samuel's Speech (12:1-25).

72) 'd ("witness"; noun) 12:5.

D: Deut. 5:20; 17:6; 19:15, 16, 18; 31:19, 21, 26.

E: Gen. 31:44, 48, 50, 52; Ex. 20:16; 22:12; 23:1.

In the feminine: Gen. 21:20; 31:52; Jos.

24:27.

73) htysbw ("present yourselves") 12:7, 16. Repeat;
cf. #70.

74) r'w ("See!") 12:16.

Either in sing. or plural:

D: Deut. 1:8, 21; 2:24, 31; 4:5; 11:26; 30:15;

Jos. 23:4.

E: Gen. 27:27; 31:12, 50; Ex. 4:21; 33:12.

75) bywm hhw' ("on that day") 12:18. Repeat, cf.
#57.

76) htpll ("pray" for us) 12:19, 23. Repeat, cf.
#42.

77) kl h'm ("all the people") 12:19. Repeat; cf.
#46.

78) mht' ("(I) should sin") 12:23. Repeat; cf. #47.

79) w'bdm 'tw ("serve him" - of Yahweh) 12:24.
Repeat; cf. #53.

80) yr'w ("fear (Yahweh)") 12:24.

The verb with deity as object:

D: Deut. 4:10; 5:29; 6:2, 13, 24; 8:6; 10:12, 20;

14:23; 17:19; 28:58 (His name); 31:13.

E: Gen. 22:12; 42:18; Ex. 1:17, 21; 14:31; 18:21;

Jos. 24:14.

Rejection of Saul (15:4-8, 12-14, 20-23, 29-30a, 31a, 32-34).

81) dbr-yhwh ("the word of Yahweh") 15:13. Repeat; cf.

#48.

82) lzbh ("to sacrifice") 15:21. Repeat; cf. #39.

83) ht'ty ("I have sinned") 15:30. Repeat; cf. #47.

The conclusions to be drawn from this listing of terms are twofold. It is apparent that the anti-monarchical source utilizes many terms and phrases distinctive of D and many that are distinctive of E. This has perhaps contributed to the confusion of whether to assign the passages to D or E. Even more notable, however, is the fact that over fifty percent of the terms (45 out of 83) are found in both D and E. In other words, they are representative of both sources much as the themes discussed previously.

5. Conclusions

The import of my discussion thus far centers on the date of the anti-monarchical source and the circumstances which prompted it. It is clear that 1:1-28; 2:11-26; 3:1-21; 10:17-21ab, 25a; 12:1-25; 15:4-8, 12-24, 20-23, 29-30a, 31a, 32-34 are not the work of a Deuteronomic editor writing several centuries after the events and seeking to project his opposition to the kings of Judah and Israel into this period. Often the pericope in 8:11-18 has been taken as evidence of late composition because it details abuses of

kings which could be derived from the history of the monarchy in Israel and Judah.¹⁶⁴ It is not unlikely that Samuel or the author had in mind practices of kings with which he was quite familiar, however. On the basis of texts from Ugarit and Alalakh, I. Mendelsohn has demonstrated that such arbitrary acts were committed by kings in the late second millennium.¹⁶⁵ Samuel warns that a king will conscript a professional army from among the people (vv. 11b-12a). In the Canaanite city-state, the king appointed certain members of the aristocracy as maryannu, or charioteers. The commoners were pressed into service as foot soldiers.¹⁶⁶ For their services, the maryannu received crown lands, over which they exercised domain as fief-holders. Hence, Samuel warns, "He will take the best of your fields and vineyards and olive orchards and give them to his servants." The recipient of a fief, whether soldier or civil servant, was required to return some of the produce of the land to the king, who retained ownership of the land. The taxes referred to in Ugaritic documents include the tithe (ma'saru),

¹⁶⁴Budde, Samuel, p. 55. George Caird, "Introduction and Exegesis of I-II Samuel," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George Buttrick (Nashville, 1953), II, 921-22. Noth, History of Israel, p. 172, f.n. 3.

¹⁶⁵I. Mendelsohn, "Samuel's Denunciation of Kingship in the Light of Akkadian Documents from Ugarit," BASOR 143 (1956), pp. 17-22. Further evidence of the practices of royalty is provided in the discussion of royal administration at Ugarit by A. F. Rainey, "The Kingdom of Ugarit," BA XXVIII (1965), 112-17.

¹⁶⁶Mendelsohn, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

to which Samuel refers in vv. 15, 17a, "He will take the tenth of your grain and of your vineyards and give it to his officers and to his servants. He will take the tenth of your flocks."¹⁶⁷ The king exercised complete control over the disposal of property. Thus, if real estate was transferred from one subject to another or divided between brothers, the transaction was done before the king.¹⁶⁸

Finally Samuel warns the people that they will be forced to serve the king as tillers of the land, craftsmen, cooks, bakers, perfumers (vv. 12b-13). In the Akkadian texts from Ugarit, the terms "king's service" (šipri šarri) and "palace service" (šipri ēkallium) appear. It is not exactly clear what these mean, but Mendelsohn quotes a passage which states that on one occasion the tenants of the land were exempt from "king's service." This suggests that their normal service to the king included corvee labor.¹⁶⁹ That Samuel had in mind such practices of foreign kings is particularly suitable to the context of his remarks, since the people desire a king like other nations. The parallels from Ugarit are no more than circumstantial evidence, but it does make possible if not probable that the experiences of the time of Samuel are being invoked here.

¹⁶⁷Ibid., pp. 19-21. Rainey, op. cit., p. 113.

¹⁶⁸Rainey, op. cit., pp. 114-15.

¹⁶⁹Mendelsohn, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

Furthermore, the attitude toward the monarchy in the Deuteronomic edition of I and II Kings differs from the anti-monarchical narrative before us. Noth has spoken of a consistent Deuteronomic view of the kingship.¹⁷⁰ Nevertheless, the opposition to the monarchy set forth in I Sam. 1-15 appears to call into question the institution itself: it is a rejection of Yahweh. The sin lies not in the manner of the kings but in the very desire for the monarchy. Thus, the people implore Samuel to pray for them, "Pray for your servants to Yahweh your God, that we may not die; for we have added to all our sins this evil, to ask for ourselves a king." In a sense, the passages in I Sam. 15 go beyond this, in the censure of Saul--now acting as king--for failing to observe the ban. This particular sin, however, relates directly to the theology of Holy War and thus to the role of Yahweh as absolute sovereign. It is the same command which rested upon Israel's earliest charismatic leaders, as in the case of Joshua and Achan (Jos. 6: 18-24; 7:1ff), at Ai (8:2, 27ff), at Makkedah and Libnah (10:28ff), and at Jabesh-Gilead on behalf of the Benjaminites (Jos. 21:11). The issue of herem is a reminder that Saul, too, owes his victory to Yahweh. Hence, the failure to offer the spoil of war to Yahweh is a rejection of Him in a quite specific way, as would not be the case in other misdemeanors.

¹⁷⁰Noth, Studien, pp. 91-92.

The Deuteronomist in his edition of Kings has a different attitude toward the monarchy. The central question is not the legitimacy of the office but the extent to which each king maintains the purity of the central sanctuary at Jerusalem and opposes all Canaanite high places. Other judgments are made against the kings, such as their trust (bth) in Yahweh (II Kgs. 18:5) and whether they were "perfect with Yahweh" (šlm 'm yhw, I Kgs. 11:4; 15:3, 14). In the treatise on the fall of Israel (II Kgs. 17:7ff), the Deuteronomist indicts the king and people for setting up Asherim, for serving idols, and forsaking the statutes and commandments of Yahweh.¹⁷¹ Such is the acceptance of kingship, however, on the part of the Deuteronomist that praise is reserved for two of Israel's kings, Hezekiah (II Kgs. 18:3; 20:3; 21:3) and Josiah (II Kgs. 23:24-25). Even more significant is the regard for David, whose kingdom shall never fall (II Sam. 7:13-15). In spite of the terrible disobedience and apostasy committed by Israel and Judah--and the punishment which could only follow such acts--this promise is not forgotten, as the brief reference to Jehoiachin's release from prison suggests (II Kgs. 25:27-30). The word of judgment does not entirely supersede the word of grace.¹⁷² Also the picture of David which the Deuteronomist

¹⁷¹ von Rad, Studies, pp. 75-77.

¹⁷² Ibid., pp. 88-89.

gives indicates that his attitude toward kingship is far from complete rejection (cf. I Kgs. 11:4, 6; 14:8; 15:3).¹⁷³ It would seem that the attitude toward kingship on the part of the Deuteronomist is noticeably distinct from that in the Samuel-Saul traditions.

Nor can we speak of these passages as precisely the Elohist source. The presence of unquestionably Deuteronomic phrases (notably in chap. 12; cf. pp. 202-203 above) cautions against speaking of the Elohist per se, as does the narrative form of exhortation in such passages as 7:3-4 and 12:1-15. While of course not unknown to E (cf. Jos. 24), such passages are more characteristic of D where the milieu of God's action is the realm of proclamation and exhortation rather than the realm of narration.

While we are unable then to assign the account either to the Elohist or the Deuteronomist, the theory suggests itself that these passages are representative of traditions which are antecedent to these sources. In other words, they rise from a group--of prophetic concerns and probably northern--which likewise could claim as its own the circle of traditions from which E and D derive. The traditions which were at the heart of the opposition to the monarchy eventually issued in the separate sources of E and D.

This theory accords well with current researches that indicate a date for the origins of the Elohist and for

¹⁷³Ibid., pp. 87-88.

Urdeuteronomium in the pre-monarchical period or at least early in the period of the monarchy. As early as the end of the nineteenth century, Rudolph Kittel noted the artificiality of arguments proposed by Wellhausen which claimed that E was less anthropomorphic, more prone to religious explanations for events, and thus later in date than J.¹⁷⁴ He proposed a date subsequent to the division of the monarchy but prior to the time of spiritual crisis when Elijah and Elisha prophesied. Similarly Procksch, in 1906, denied that E was dependent on J. He noted the important differences in characterization and style, as in the Abraham narratives; yet the two sources are parallel in many of the events they portray. Procksch favored a theory that both J and E derived from a single major tradition. Procksch assigned chronological priority to the Elohist, whose influence was exerted on later prophetic and Deuteronomic literature. As with the basic tradition in general, so also E in particular shows closest affinities with northern traditions, such as the Joseph narratives; Bethel and Shechem are prominent in his account.¹⁷⁵ More recently Noth¹⁷⁶ and Speiser¹⁷⁷ are among the scholars who suggest

¹⁷⁴Kittel, op. cit., I, 70.

¹⁷⁵O. Procksch, Das nordhebräische Sagenbuch: die Elohimquelle (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 305-08.

¹⁷⁶Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte, pp. 248-49.

¹⁷⁷E. A. Speiser, Genesis, eds. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Anchor Bible, I; Garden City, 1964), p. xxx, no. 5.

that E antedates J or at least that the Elohist is dependent upon earlier traditions than those underlying the southern source. The emphasis in the Elohist upon the central role of the charismatic leader rather than the institutional monarch and upon the exodus-conquest traditions suggests that its pre-literary origins may lie in the pre-monarchical period. In an unpublished dissertation, Alan W. Jenks has concluded from an examination of the Elohist source and then of various prophetic traditions surrounding Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, Hosea, and Deuteronomy, that the close relationship of the Elohist with the anti-monarchical traditions regarding Samuel and Saul means that we must look to the age of Samuel for the birth of E, among prophetic circles whose founder was Samuel.¹⁷⁸

With regard to D, it also centers upon the traditions of exodus-conquest and the covenant, as I have sought to demonstrate. Furthermore, the concern with distinctness from other religions, the attention to offices of the theocracy such as levite, judge, and prophet, and the prevalence of Holy War ideology suggest Urdeuteronomium's orientation in the ordinances and institutions of pre-monarchic Israel.¹⁷⁹ In this context, the pericope on the king is quite "astonishing."¹⁸⁰ The ideology of the

¹⁷⁸Jenks, op. cit., p. 230.

¹⁷⁹von Rad, Deuteronomy, pp. 23ff.

¹⁸⁰Ibid., p. 118.

Holy War is particularly significant in considering the milieu for the origin of the traditions underlying Deuteronomy. "The proper period of the Holy War was the period of the old Israelite Amphictyony, that is, the period of the Judges."¹⁸¹ This institution ceased after the advent of the monarchy. In the institution of kingship, the king was the leader in war, not Yahweh nor Yahweh's charismatic leader. The institution also broke down under the pressure of threats to the state. The older system of a militia raised from levies of free citizens in the tribes was gradually replaced by trained mercenaries headed by the king.¹⁸²

Edward Robertson has argued that Deuteronomy itself was written by Samuel. He speaks both of basic purposes in Deuteronomy and of individual pericopes as evidence that the age of Samuel is hereby reflected. Israel's occupation of Canaan, the growth of nationalistic feeling, and the importance of resisting Canaanite religion would have been primary concerns for Samuel as leader of "all Israel." The unity of the scattered tribes could be accomplished by a sanctuary. This appears as a major theme in Deuteronomy, as is the motif of "all Israel."¹⁸³ It is not explicit in

¹⁸¹ von Rad, Studies, p. 46.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Edward Robertson, "Temple and Torah," BJRL 26 (1941-42), pp. 187-90.

the concerns of Samuel, however. The prophet-priest is associated not with one sanctuary but with numerous ones. He gives no hint that the situation is undesirable. Robertson himself admits that Samuel did not accomplish his task but that it was left to David and Solomon to bring to fruition.¹⁸⁴ Similarly Robertson argues that it was Samuel who compiled numerous legal and historical traditions of the nation into what is now the Torah, having composed Deuteronomy as a summary and interpretative statement.¹⁸⁵ This theory, enticing though it may be, rests precariously upon the actual evidence. I Sam. 10:25a does speak of Samuel's writing the "manner of the kingdom." This hardly suggests, however, the body of material encompassed in the Pentateuch! Robertson's observations with regard to individual pericopes are more convincing, however. These parallels suggest not that the book was written in the age of Samuel but that the same milieu is reflected. The instruction to the king and the deposit of a copy of the law that he might read (Deut. 17:14-20) is reminiscent of Samuel's actions in I Sam. 10:25a. Similarly the venomous curse against Amalek (Deut. 25:17-18) echoes again in the vicious murder of Agag by Samuel (I Sam. 15:32-34).¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴Ibid., p. 190.

¹⁸⁵Ibid., pp. 191-92.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., p. 194.

Apart from the question of a written "source," it seems warranted to conclude that the origins of the traditions which constitute D and E can be dated in the late amphictyonic or early monarchical period. This means that the anti-monarchical source in I Sam. 1-15 would date from the same period. To refer to these traditions as antecedent to E and D implies no strict chronological schema, although the evidence set forth above does lead to the conclusion that they are to be dated before the time when E and D were set forth as separate sources, each with its own distinctive features.¹⁸⁷ A probable terminus a quo for the accounts in the anti-monarchical source would be the death of Samuel, an event which would prompt his followers to perpetuate the memory of his deeds. A terminus ad quem would be the point at which the birth and call narrative was added to the remainder of the source, since the former is the youngest of the traditions.¹⁸⁸ Noth has suggested that the birth and call narrative received final form in the time of Ahijah, who was linked with Shiloh (I Kgs. 14: 2, 4) as was Samuel. The prophetic circle around Ahijah would be concerned to preserve the traditions of Samuel's birth and call since only in these passages is the prophet associated with the cult sanctuary of Shiloh.¹⁸⁹ I think

¹⁸⁷On the dating of these two sources, see below, pp. 304-08.

¹⁸⁸See above, p. 138, f.n. 36.

¹⁸⁹Noth, "Samuel und Silo," pp. 399-400.

it is conceivable that the same group added the birth and call narrative to the remainder of the anti-monarchical source. The strong rebuke which Ahijah speaks against Jeroboam, son of Nebat, for ignoring Yahweh's commands is reminiscent of the prophetic opposition to the monarchy in the anti-monarchical passages. With the possible exception then of the birth and call narrative, the anti-monarchical source received a fixed form considerably earlier.

This analysis of the anti-monarchical source has sought to indicate the importance of these traditions as a means for understanding the function of Samuel in Israel's political and religious communities. In Robertson's essay, he confronts the question of why Samuel is not mentioned in the Pentateuch, which the prophet compiled. In part the answer for Robertson lies in the fact that Samuel was preserving sacred traditions which would have to be associated with Moses. Robertson, however, notes that Samuel may have been considered as the Mosaic figure of his time. He finds Samuel's signature in the etiology of the prophet in Deut. 18:15-18. The prophet whom Yahweh will raise up "like unto thee" (Moses) is Samuel himself.¹⁹⁰ Robertson does not pursue this suggestion and examine the possible evidence in detail. Such an investigation suggests itself not because Robertson's theory that

¹⁹⁰Robertson, "Temple and Torah," p. 202. Muilenburg, "Office," pp. 92-93. Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

Samuel wrote Deuteronomy is convincing but because of the similarities between the Urdeuteronomium-Elohists circle of traditions and the portrayal of Samuel in the anti-monarchical passages of I Sam. 1-15. What is the relation between Samuel's functions and those of Moses? between the events narrated about each? To what extent does Samuel renew and proclaim those saving events which are associated with Moses in the period of exodus and wilderness wandering? And finally how does the portrayal of Samuel relate to the particular historical situation of his day: the need and legitimacy of the monarchy?

CHAPTER V

THE FIGURE OF SAMUEL IN THE ANTI-MONARCHICAL SOURCE

The foregoing chapter has called attention to the affinities of the anti-monarchical source in I Sam. 1-15 with the Elohist and Deuteronomic streams of tradition or sources. Not only does this mean that consideration of the historical validity of these traditions is imperative, since the traditions in these two Hexateuchal sources are early¹ but it also suggests that the figure of Samuel, the theocratic leader of Israel in the anti-monarchical source, is closely related to that of Moses, the prophet par excellence and the leader of "all Israel" in both E and D. In varying ways scholars have frequently associated Samuel with Moses. In a comment that illustrates the limitations of literary criticism, Wellhausen wrote, "He is a second Moses? Yes. But that does not tell us much."² H. P. Smith concluded that in his stature as the theocratic ruler of Israel, Samuel was comparable only to Moses.³ For

¹Among recent scholars who have urged that more historical credence be accorded the anti-monarchical source are Hertzberg, op. cit., pp. 65-66. Seebass, "Traditionsgeschichte," pp. 286-87. Weiser, Samuel, pp. 5-6, 68-69.

²Wellhausen, Prolegomena, p. 255.

³Smith, op. cit., p. xvi.

Albright, Samuel is "the first great religious reformer after Moses"⁴ and for Volz, "the faithful guardian of the Mosaic heritage."⁵ The characterization of Samuel as another Moses is not confined to modern Biblical scholarship, however. The Old Testament itself makes the equation quite explicit. In Jer. 15:1, Yahweh says to Jeremiah, "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my heart would not turn toward this people." Thus in the time of Jeremiah the most highly esteemed intercessors in Israel's history are her leader in the exodus and wilderness wandering and her leader in the pre-monarchical period. No less significant is the way in which Samuel is associated with Moses and Aaron in Ps. 99:6, "Moses and Aaron were among his priests, Samuel also was among those who called on his name."

Such lofty estimates of Samuel by biblical scholars and by the biblical text suggest, indeed require, that an attempt be made to mark and delineate the similarities in the portrayal and characterization of Samuel in the anti-monarchical source and of Moses in E and D. This inquiry is further suggested by the affinities already noted between the anti-monarchical source and those traditions underlying

⁴Albright, op. cit., p. 18.

⁵Paul Volz, Prophetengestalten des Alten Testaments (Stuttgart, 1949), p. 75. Cf. also Hylander, op. cit., p. 239. Jenks, op. cit., p. 223. Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 43. Kraus, Die prophetische Verkündigung, pp. 22ff. Scharbert, op. cit., p. 245.

the Elohist and Deuteronomy.⁶ Evidence that Moses and Samuel were remembered in similar ways and revered as leaders in similar capacities over "all Israel" would add to the argument for a common origin of the three sources in northern prophetic circles. In order to compare the portrayal of Samuel in the anti-monarchical source with that of Moses in E⁷ and D I will undertake to assess (1) literary affinities within the traditions, i.e., similar themes and common phraseology, (2) form-critical parallels, (3) identical functions ascribed to both leaders.

1. Literary Affinities

The birth of Samuel (1:1-28) and the birth of Moses (Ex. 1:1-2:10) diverge at many points, notably in the predominant wisdom motifs of the latter⁸ and in the theme of the child's exposure or rejection, classically illustrated in the account of the birth of Sargon.⁹ Nevertheless the

⁶See above, pp. 152-85.

⁷Generally I have followed Eissfeldt's identification of the Elohist passages. See above, p. 153, f.n. 64. In those instances where I depart from his analysis, I have so indicated.

⁸Brevard Childs points to the portrayal of the Pharaoh as a "wicked fool" whose plan to kill every Hebrew child is thwarted by the midwives. Furthermore the sister plays the role of the "wise counselor" (cf. Joseph before the Pharaoh; Gen. 41:39), and the piety of the midwives who refuse to obey the Pharaoh is emphasized (Ex. 1:17; cf. Prov. 14:26). Brevard Childs, "The Birth of Moses," JBL LXXXIV (1965), pp. 120-21.

⁹E. A. Speiser, "The Legend of Sargon," Ancient Near Eastern Texts, ed. James B. Pritchard (second edition; Princeton, 1955), p. 119, lines 1-6.

account of the birth of Samuel does have certain themes in common with the narrative of Moses. In his article, Childs notes that contrary to the "rags to riches" account of Sargon's childhood, the birth of Moses is deliberately set in the context of the oppression of the Israelites so that Moses is recognized from the first as the one to deliver his people. It is only after the account of his birth and upbringing in Pharaoh's home that he is subjected to the humiliation of a threat against his life and exile in the wilderness (2:11ff). This is quite the opposite of the "exposure saga" in the Ancient Near East where humiliation precedes exaltation.¹⁰ Furthermore, Moses is rescued and raised by an Egyptian princess instead of by a peasant family. This detail, which also presents a sympathetic view of the Egyptians, underscores the special position of Moses.¹¹ The story of Moses' birth is essentially a personal account. Yet it has momentous importance for many others, since it is placed in the context of the oppression and slaughter of the Israelites.

In a similar way, Samuel's birth is an event whose significance far transcends the family of Elkanah. The connection with the temple at Shiloh, where Hannah makes her vow and Samuel is brought suggests that the birth of Samuel is a highly significant event for Israel.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 115-16.

¹¹Ibid.

Furthermore Eli is involved in the account from the very beginning, and the contrast is notable between the family of Samuel and the house of Eli (see above, p. 138). The way in which the fate of Samuel and Eli are intertwined is reminiscent of the ironical fact that Moses is rescued and nurtured by the very Egyptians whom he will oppose and defeat.¹² The princess protects the young Moses in the very household of the Pharaoh. In a similar way Samuel ministers to Yahweh "before Eli." It is Eli who leads Samuel to receive the word of Yahweh which seals the doom of Eli's house (3:2-14). Moses' birth points to his task of delivering his people from foreign domination. This is not as apparent in Samuel's case where the Philistine threat does not appear until later. Nevertheless the times are critical, and Samuel is a deliverer. The word of Yahweh was rare in the land. With Samuel's advent, Yahweh once again reveals himself to his people at Shiloh (3:19ff). It is stressed with regard to both Moses and Samuel that Yahweh is responding to the crisis of his people. Thus, in Moses' call, Yahweh says, "I have seen the affliction ('ny) of my people who are in Egypt. . . ." (Ex. 3:7). In the account of Samuel's birth, Hannah pleads to her God, "Yahweh of hosts, if you will look upon the affliction (b'ny) of your handmaiden, . . ." (1:11).¹³ The context of the latter is

¹²Ibid., p. 118.

¹³Bourke, op. cit., p. 84.

clearly personal and thus more limited than Yahweh's observation about the Israelites' affliction in Egypt. Nevertheless the similarity of the motif of affliction is noteworthy. The narrative of the call is not only northern in its stress upon the auditory and in the prominence of the dabar (3:1b, 7; cf. I Kgs. 17:2, 8, 24) but is parallel to Moses' call in the use of the double vocative, "Samuel! Samuel!" and in the response, "Here am I" (hnnny; cf. Ex. 3:4).¹⁴

Turning to the succeeding passages in the anti-monarchical source, further parallels in themes and phraseology exist with Mosaic accounts in the Pentateuch. In 7:3b, Samuel relates obedience and deliverance by calling upon the Israelites to obey the covenant as a condition of deliverance from the Philistines. In a closely parallel way, Moses also places this proposal before the Israelites:

If you will be careful to do all this commandment which I command you to do, loving Yahweh your God, walking in all his ways, and cleaving to him, then Yahweh will drive out all these nations before you. . . . (Deut. 11:22-23)

The events of I Sam. 7 culminate in the victory of Yahweh over the Philistines (v. 10b). While not responsible for the deliverance of his people, Samuel does make possible this saving act by offering a burnt sacrifice and calling upon Yahweh (v. 9). In the Elohist account in Ex. 17:9-13 of the battle with the Amalekites, a similar event occurs. Moses performs the symbolic act of raising his arms, which

¹⁴Bourke, op. cit., pp. 73-74. Muilenburg, "Covenantal Formulations," p. 91. Newman, "The Prophetic Call," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, p. 84.

serves to bring victory to the Israelites over their enemy.

Moses and Samuel alike speak negatively concerning the kingship. The catalogue of abusive practices by kings that Samuel sets forth in 8:11-18 makes clear the way in which royalty exploits the men of the land, appropriates the produce of the country, and takes the best stock for its own tasks. In a less detailed way, but equally negative in tone, Moses speaks of the laws of kingship (Deut. 17:16-17). These stipulations reflect a low estimate of the manner in which kings conduct themselves: ". . . he must not multiply horses for himself, . . . he shall not multiply wives for himself . . . nor shall he greatly multiply for himself silver and gold."¹⁵ Furthermore, both passages speak of the desire to be like other nations (kkl-hgwym, Deut. 17:14b; I Sam. 8:5).¹⁶

Much was said in the preceding chapter to indicate that Samuel is linked with Moses through association with covenant traditions. This is further evidenced by the

¹⁵The referent for the two passages is different. The laws in Deuteronomy seem to reflect the abuses of Solomon. Driver, Deuteronomy, pp. 211-12. On the other hand, Samuel or those responsible for the traditions in I Sam. 8 may have had contemporary realities in mind; see above, p. 213.

¹⁶Some scholars, having in mind the pre-Deuteronomistic origin of the Samuel traditions, have argued that the passage in 8:11-18, as well as the reference to the king as chosen by Yahweh (10:24), suggest that these traditions influenced the composition of Deut. 17:14ff. Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 212. Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, p. 183ff.

terminology of two passages in Samuel's speech of 12:1-25. In vv. 3-5, Samuel utilizes laws of the Covenant Code (20:22-23:19; E) proclaimed by Moses. The rhetorical questions reflect a series of apodictic laws:¹⁷

את שור מי לקחתי
 וחמור מי לקחתי
 ואת מי עשיתי
 את מי רצותי
 ומידי מי לקחתי כפר

As already indicated (see above, p. 192), the laws that underlie these questions come from the Covenant Code, proclaimed by Moses.

In another portion of Samuel's speech, he sets forth the obligations that rest upon the Israelites in covenant relation with their God:

If you fear Yahweh and serve him and obey his voice; if you do not rebel against Yahweh your God and both you and the king who reigns over you follow after Yahweh, your God, he will save you (amended text; cf. Chapter III, p. 109). But if you do not obey the voice of Yahweh and rebel against him, the hand of Yahweh will be against you and your king to destroy you" (amended text; cf. Chapter III, p. 109).

A similar conditional is also spoken by Moses in a covenant context, although its position in the Gattung appears to differ slightly. Thus, Moses concludes the Covenant Code with the "blessing" portion of the conditional: "But if you hearken attentively to his voice and

¹⁷Muilenburg, op. cit., p. 362.

do all that I say, then I will be an enemy to your enemies and an adversary to your adversaries" (Ex. 23:22). If such a conditional is a "prefatory sentence" in the covenant Gattung, to be followed by blessings or curses, as Noth¹⁸ suggests, then a more elaborate list of curses and of blessings would be expected to follow. Such is the case when Moses again speaks the covenant conditional in Deut. 28:1 and 15. First Moses proclaims the condition for blessing (v. 1) which is followed by a list of blessings (vv. 2-14). The latter is much more brief than the list of curses, as is normal in treaties of the Ancient Near East.¹⁹ Then Moses makes clear that disobedience will bring curses (v. 15). A lengthy, detailed listing of curses follows. This is not the exact context reflected in Samuel's speech. Nevertheless the twofold conditional of reward and judgment is similar to Moses' pronouncements.

The Elohist source characteristically portrays Moses as a miracle worker. Thus the plagues occur by the use of the rod given to Moses by Yahweh (Ex. 4:2; 7:17; 8:5). The use of the rod in the battle with the Amalekites has already been noted. On at least one occasion such a miraculous deed is set forth in a cultic context. In Ex. 14:13 Moses commands the Israelites to stand before their God and witness

¹⁸Martin Noth, "For all who rely on works of the law are under a curse," Laws, p. 123.

¹⁹Delbert Hillers, Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets (Rome, 1964), p. 6.

Yahweh's "saving deed" (yšw't yhw). He then uses his rod to part the waters of the Reed Sea. Although the act is one of judgment, not deliverance, Samuel similarly calls forth a miraculous event: Yahweh's destruction of the harvest with thunder and rain (12:17-18). This, too, is in a cultic setting, and the key words in both pericopes are identical: hytšbw wr'w ("present yourselves and behold"), Ex. 14:13 and I Sam. 12:16.

2. Form-Critical Parallels

In addition to similarities in themes and in certain terminology of the Samuel traditions in the anti-monarchical source and those related to Moses in E and D, form-critical parallels exist which link these two major figures in Israel's history. These parallels point to the larger context in which traditions about Moses and Samuel were remembered--a context notably prophetic and covenantal. An important point of comparison is the structure of the call of Samuel and the Gattung of Moses' call (Ex. 3:1-12). N. Habel has isolated the latter with reference to its major elements:²⁰

Confrontation (Ex. 3:1-3, 4a). In the context of ordinary activities the divine intervention occurs: "Moses was

²⁰N. Habel, "The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives," ZAW LXXVII (1965), pp. 318-19.

tending the flock . . . a messenger of Yahweh appeared."

Introductory Word. The Historical Basis (3:4b-9). Yahweh presents himself and calls to his servant. The formulae include use of qr', as befits the primarily auditory form of the call, and the double vocative: "Moses. Moses." But there is more. Yahweh reveals himself by giving His name, and He notes the affliction of the people which He has observed. This portion of the call begins with qr' . . . hnyy: the divine initiative and the servant's response.

Divine Commission (3:10). This central element begins with the key word of emphasis, w'th ("and now") which links the events of the past with the responsibilities of the present. Moses' commission is specifically an action: to deliver the Israelites from Egypt.

Prophet's Objection (3:11). This common phenomenon of the prophetic call makes explicit the burden of the man of God. Moses is quite naturally staggered by the task before him.

Divine Assurance (3:12a). "But I will be with you."

The Sign (3:12b). This is not primarily a proof to the individual. It appears "as a further demonstration that Yahweh has spoken." In this light "it strengthens the commission, gives additional impetus to the word and further enables the individual to act as God's agent."²¹

²¹Ibid., p. 319.

Significantly the sign occurs at the end of the act required of Moses. It becomes the goal of the commission as well. Furthermore the sign is not a private experience but something within the public realm.

The structure of the call of Samuel (3:1-21) is noteworthy for its similarities to this pattern, although the identity is not complete. A Gattung often undergoes changes, which reflect the special concerns and perspective of the authors.

Confrontation (3:1-4). The author describes with significant detail the setting for the call. As with Moses, Samuel is performing customary duties: "the boy Samuel was ministering to Yahweh before Eli . . . and Samuel was sleeping in the temple of Yahweh. . . ." Nevertheless a sense of foreboding, an aura of tension, is also expressed. Eli has grown old and may be ineffective (3:2). Most ominous is the fact that the dbr-yhwh was almost unknown. Divine revelation no longer was known to many.

As in the call of Moses, the setting is cultic-- indeed more so, for it occurs in the temple at Shiloh whose importance as a center of worship in the amphictyony is apparent from the practice of annual sacrifice (cf. Jud. 21: 19ff; I Sam. 1:3; 2:14, 19).²² The annual celebration at Shiloh may well have been one of covenant renewal, since the

²²Kraus, Worship, pp. 173-77. The passage in Judges refers to an annual festival, perhaps an autumn fertility celebration in light of the reference to ecstatic dances.

latter was at the heart of the tribes' cultic life as indicated by Jos. 24 and in the traditions underlying Deut. 31:10ff.²³ In this cultic setting, the presence of Yahweh is clear. As the power of the divine presence is evident in the burning bush, so here it is dramatized by the presence of the ark: ". . . and Samuel was sleeping in the temple of Yahweh where the ark of God was" (3:3). Although the word of Yahweh was rare, nevertheless when it was present the ark marked the deus praesens. Thus, petitions were made in the presence of the ark at Shiloh (1:3, 9ff) and Samuel's call occurs before the ark. The glory of Yahweh was present with the ark. Indeed it was the throne of ywh sb'wt ysb hkrbyn (4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2).²⁴ This, however, may not have been a permanent presence; as an earthly king, so Yahweh would ascend the throne when He desired to invoke his authority in ruling. Thus Ps. 80:2 bids Yahweh to appear: "Thou who art enthroned upon the cherubin, appear!" And in Num. 10:35ff, the battle cry is a call to Yahweh to take his place on the throne: "Arise, Yahweh!"²⁵ Nevertheless, in this account of Samuel's call, the ark is

²³John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia, 1959), p. 149. Newman, "The Prophetic Call," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, p. 88.

²⁴Kraus, Worship, p. 177.

²⁵Walter Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, tr. S. Rudman (Oxford, 1961; tr. of Herkenft und Geschichte der Eltersten Sinaitraditionen), p. 117.

clearly synonymous with Yahweh's presence. On two occasions Samuel is called by Yahweh before any mention is made of Yahweh "presenting himself" (wytygb; v. 10). Before this, it suffices simply to speak of the ark and then move directly to "and Yahweh said" (vv. 3b-4).²⁶

Introductory Word. The Historical Basis (3:5-14). Significantly, the passage begins with the same key words as in the call of Moses: the verb qr' ("to call") and the exclamation, hnyy ("Behold, here am I")--both of which are characteristic of the Elohist.²⁷ Emphasis is given to the auditory character of the call and to the motif of summons and response by the threefold expression of the formula: hnyy ky qr't ly ("Here I am, for you called me"), vv. 5, 6, 8. On the third occasion, Samuel acknowledges Yahweh and hears the awful pronouncement against the house of Eli (vv. 12-14). This indictment and prophecy of doom parallel very closely the passage in 2:27-36, so that the passages seem to have arisen independently of each other.²⁸ One might term this prophecy of punishment as the commission in the call Gattung. Yet it is not, for Yahweh is here establishing his word, and Samuel is not the agent for the

²⁶Gerhard von Rad, "The Tent and the Ark," Problem of the Hexateuch, p. 109.

²⁷Jenks, The Elohist, p. 221. Newman, "The Prophetic Call," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, p. 94.

²⁸Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 42.

events willed by Yahweh. The commission is surprisingly absent from Samuel's call. Nevertheless, Samuel is aware that his confrontation with Yahweh marks a new era that means not only the end of the house of Eli but his beginning as a servant of Yahweh. Hence, he withdraws from the awesome event:

Prophet's Objection (3:15). "Samuel awoke in the morning and opened the doors of the house of Yahweh. But Samuel feared to tell Eli the vision." This is not precisely the type of fear expressed by Moses (Ex. 3:11, 13). Nevertheless, an element does exist in common: the need to deny the reality or the imperative nature of Yahweh's word. Samuel would keep it to himself and thus prevent its occurrence. That this is the case is suggested by v. 18 where Eli acknowledges the word of Yahweh and adds, "May Yahweh do what is good in his eyes." Samuel is unable to deny Yahweh's presence and tells Eli the revelation he has received. Samuel's situation is similar to that of Jeremiah when he laments

If I say, 'I will not mention him, or speak any more
in his name,' there is in my heart as it were a
burning fire shut up in my bones,

and I am weary with holding it in, and I cannot (Jer. 20:9).

Reassurance (3:16-18). In the call of Moses, the reassurance comes directly from Yahweh (3:12). Such is not the case with Samuel, although it is clear from the key words that Eli

speaks for Yahweh: the central words of the call appear again, wyqr' . . . hny ("And Eli called Samuel . . . and he said, 'here am I'"). Eli is the one who offers reassurance, an act which heightens the irony of the narrative since the word of prophecy has sealed the fate of his house.

The Sign (3:19-4:1a).²⁹ The closing passage strikes a note that is resonant of the opening verse. The word of Yahweh, which was rare in the land, is now established because Samuel is faithful (n'mn) to his function as a prophet before Yahweh (nby'lyhwh). The sign is threefold. It involves the prophet himself. His words are not in vain (wl'-hpyl mkl-dbryw 'rsh; cf. Jer. 21:43; II Kgs. 10:10 for a parallel phrase). The sign also consists of the people's recognition of Samuel and of Yahweh's presence. It is clear that Yahweh is once again enthroned at his sanctuary. Finally Samuel's position is an unmistakable indication to the house of Eli that the prophet is now the mediator and defender of the sacral traditions.³⁰ The sign

²⁹Cf. the discussion of the text in Chapter III, pp. 91-93. . . On the basis of the textual evidence for this passage, I would translate as follows: "Samuel grew and Yahweh was with him. He caused none of his words to fall to the ground, and all Israel from Dan to Beersheba knew that Samuel was faithful as a prophet before Yahweh. Yahweh once again appeared at Shiloh, for Yahweh revealed himself to Samuel. But Eli was exceedingly old; his sons followed after him, but their way was evil to Yahweh. The word of Samuel came to all Israel."

³⁰Newman puts this succinctly in saying, "The prophet succeeds the priest!" Newman, "The Prophetic Call," Israel's

in Samuel's call, therefore, is not simply one event as in the case of Moses (cf. Ex. 3:12, ". . . this shall be the sign for you, that I have sent you . . . you shall serve God upon this mountain."). In Samuel's case the sign consists of a new order that manifests itself in several ways. Samuel is established as a prophet. The word of Yahweh returns to Shiloh. And the rule of the house of Eli comes to an end. In spite of this important difference the sign in both cases is in the public realm and a testimony to Yahweh's continuing relation to his people.

My discussion has thus far sought to highlight the similarities between the call of Moses and the call of Samuel. The only major discrepancy is the absence of the commission in Samuel's case. This phenomenon points to the fact that Samuel's advent does not in itself re-establish Yahweh's presence. Rather it marks the act of Yahweh, or bears witness to it. Samuel's "call" is not to a proclamation of God's judgment or to a specific task, as in the case of Moses. Instead Samuel is to bear witness to God's judgment against the house of Eli. This discrepancy in the Gattung underscores the suggestion in the traditions that Samuel is not a prophet in the sense of

Prophetic Heritage, p. 89. This attention to the two offices is misleading in the sense that Samuel is so much more than prophet, at least as the term is usually understood. Thus his priestly functions are evident in later chapters. Nevertheless it is clear that Samuel succeeds Eli.

"the unasked and unbidden messenger" of God's word,³¹ as were the classical prophets and also Moses himself. Only twice is Samuel called a prophet (3:20; 9:9); the common formulae of prophetic speech (kh 'mr yhwh) is placed in Samuel's mouth only on two occasions, 10:18 and 15:2. These facts may explain that Samuel's deeds and the account of his call stand at the beginnings of the prophetic movement, as argued by Albright³² and Newman³³ respectively. I believe it is more instructive, however, to emphasize the diversity of Samuel's activities as theocratic ruler in contrast to the classical prophets but in direct continuity with Moses.

A more indirect affinity of the Samuel traditions in the anti-monarchical source with those of Moses in E and D occurs in the use of the rib Gattung. Recent form-critical scholarship has suggested the importance of the rib as a major Gattung associated with the covenant. Hermann Gunkel, in his major form-critical study of the Psalms, defined the structure of the "Gerichtsrede," most notably Ps. 50 and 82. Although he did not relate this to covenant motifs, nevertheless his discoveries form the basis for later identifications. The structure identified by Gunkel was twofold: one in which Yahweh was judge, the other with Yahweh as plaintiff.

³¹Newman, "The Prophetic Call," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, p. 92.

³²Samuel, op. cit., passim.

³³"The Prophetic Call," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, p. 87.

Yahweh as Judge.

- I. Description of the judgment scene (Ps. 82:1, "God has taken his place in the divine council; in the midst of the gods he holds judgment").
- II. Address to the Accused (Ps. 82:2, "How long will you judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked?").
 - A. Absolute indefensibility of the accused's position (Ps. 82:5).
 - B. Accusation or Indictment (Ps. 50:16-20).
- III. Judgment (Ps. 82:6-7, "I say, 'You are gods, sons of the Most High, all of you; nevertheless, you shall die like men and fall like any prince.'").

Yahweh as Plaintiff

- I. Heaven and earth as Judges (Ps. 50:6).
- II. Summons of the Accused (Ps. 50:7).
- III. Address (in the second person).
 - A. Accusation, in question form.
 - B. Weakness of Accused's Position (Ps. 50:8; Is. 43:22ff).
 - C. Formal Indictment (Ps. 50:21b-22).³⁴

In an article that draws mainly on examples from the prophets (Is. 1:2-3; Jer. 2:4-13; Mi. 6:1-8), Herbert Huffmon

³⁴Hermann Gunkel and Joachim Begrich, Einleitung in die Psalmen (Handkommentar zum Alten Testaments; Göttingen, 1933), pp. 364-65.

elaborates this identification of a rīb Gattung with attention to two major items: the invocation of heaven and earth and the distinction between lawsuits connected with the divine council³⁵ and covenant lawsuits. Huffmon correctly makes a distinction between the invoking of the divine council on the one hand, as in Ps. 82, and the calling of heaven and earth, mountains and hills--in short, the natural elements--as witnesses (cf. Is. 1:2; Mi. 6:2; Ps. 50:4) on the other.³⁶ The latter are almost exclusively witnesses in covenant lawsuits. These lawsuits are further identified by their reference to the saving deeds of Yahweh, viz. the historical prologue of the covenant. Thus, in the rīb of Mi. 6:1-8, Yahweh recites his deeds in exodus and wilderness wandering (vv. 4-5) as the basis for his indictment (v. 8); cf. also Jer. 2:6-7; Deut. 32:6-14.³⁷ The value of Huffmon's analysis lies in the isolation of a lawsuit particularly associated with the covenant. This particular Gattung was unnoticed by Gunkel because it was not prominent in the Psalms. Nevertheless it commands special importance today in light of the research on covenant motifs in Biblical literature.

³⁵Cf. Frank Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," JNES XII (1953), p. 274. Thorkild Jacobsen, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," JNES II (1943), 159-72.

³⁶Herbert Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," JBL LXXVIII (1959), 290-92.

³⁷Ibid., p. 294.

Two examples of the rib Gattung deserve special notice before turning to the question of this form in the anti-monarchical source of Samuel. Although he disagrees pointedly with Huffmon's distinction of divine council versus natural elements in their role in the rib, G. Ernest Wright identifies the covenant lawsuit in the first portion of the Song of Moses, Deut. 32:1-29.³⁸ The form is closely parallel to that identified by Gunkel in the Psalms and by Huffmon in the prophets:

- I. Call to Witnesses (32:1-3). As would be expected from Huffmon's arguments, the witnesses to Yahweh's controversy with his people are heaven and earth.
- II. Preliminary Statement of Accusation (32:4-6). This is often in the form of a question as here or in Micah 6:3.
- III. Recital of Yahweh's Deeds (32:7-14). This central portion of the Gattung is at one and the same time the basis of the covenant relation and the grounds for the indictment which follows.
- IV. Indictment (32:15-18). "Jeshurun became fat and kicked. He abandoned the god who made him. He acted stupidly against the rock of his salvation." It should be noted that one element of the indictment is the foolish trust Israel has put in foreign gods, in empty idols (v. 17).
- V. The Sentence (32:19-29). The only result of Israel's

³⁸G. Ernest Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, pp. 52-54.

apostasy can be punishment, indeed destruction, for she has broken the covenant. Although Yahweh will use another people to punish Israel (32:21b), He also employs natural elements such as fire (v. 22) and famine (v. 24). In short, all of creation is in "convulsive disruption."³⁹

In addition to this important passage in Deuteronomy, attention has been called to the rîb in pericopes of the framework to the stories of the Judges.⁴⁰ In his refutation of the Deuteronomic and primarily literary character of the framework passages (except for 2:11-19), Beyerlin discusses the Gattung of 6:7-10 and 10:11b-14 in detail. He accepts the structural analysis of Huffmon and identifies the following elements of the "Bundesbruch-rîb" in these two passages: Preliminary Accusation (10:11; question form); Recital of Yahweh's deeds (6:8b-9, followed by covenant demand in 10a; 10:11-12); Indictment (6:10b; 10:13a); Sentence (10:13b only).⁴¹ An important aspect of these passages is the plea for delivery (6:7; 10:10) and the repentance of the people (10:16). This distinguishes them from the later (Deuteronomic) passage in 2:11-19 where no mention is made of the repentance of the people.⁴²

³⁹Ibid., p. 53.

⁴⁰Walter Beyerlin, "Gattung und Herkunft des Rahmens im Richterbuch," Tradition und Situation, eds. Ernst Wurthwein, Otto Kaiser (Göttingen, 1963), pp. 1-29.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 24.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 3-5.

Beyerlin denies, however, that these passages are a rîb per se; they do not have the character of a Botenwort or an Anrede. Rather, they are instructional in tone. "In den Rahmenstücken des Richterbuches ist die Gattung des Bundesbruch-rib ins Erzählend-Lehrhafte umgesetzt."⁴³

Beyerlin addresses himself to the question of the original Sitz im Leben of these passages. He denies their original literary character. In Jud. 6:8a a prophet is the one who proclaims the rîb, a reference that is probably historically correct. The pericope in Jud. 10:11-14 is introduced by a confession of sin on the part of the Israelites (v. 10), and it prompts renunciation of Israel's sinful deeds (vv. 15-16). The confession of sin suggests a cultic setting.

"Beide Jahweworte sind gewiss einmal als dramatisches Gerichtsgeschehen an der bundesbrüchigen Jahwegemeinde proklamiert worden."⁴⁴ Beyerlin does not precisely date these pericopes. He does note the close affinities in structure with Deut. 32.⁴⁵

The date of the Song of Moses has been considerably revised in recent scholarship from the late date assigned to it by earlier literary critics.⁴⁶ Eissfeldt contends

⁴³Ibid., p. 23.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 27.

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 21-23.

⁴⁶Driver, for example, argues that it is dependent on prophetic thought in the view of Israel's punishment for her lapse into idolatry (vv. 13-30). He concludes that it is a

that the poem reflects the age of Samuel. He notes that the review of "Israel's" history of apostasy extends only through the conquest. The foreign peoples whom Yahweh will use to provoke His people are the Philistines.⁴⁷ Eissfeldt sees a parallel between the theme in the Song of Moses that the battle between Israel and the "no - people" (i.e., the Philistines) is a struggle between the gods and the same theme in accounts of the battles with the Philistines. Thus in I Sam. 4-6, the ark, which is the presence of Yahweh, enters the Philistine land, causes plagues upon the people, and finally results in the defeat of Dagon (5:3-4). In II Sam. 5:20-21 David's defeat of the Philistines is referred to as a battle between Yahweh and the god of the Philistines. David exclaims, "Yahweh has broken through my enemies before me. . . ." David leaves the enemy defeated and takes away their idols with him (v. 21). Eissfeldt concludes that the poem dates from the middle of the eleventh century B.C.⁴⁸

Shortly after the publication of Eissfeldt's monograph

historical retrospect upon Israel's history, written at the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The foreign oppressors are the Babylonians. Driver, Introduction, pp. 96-97.

⁴⁷Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 226-27. Cf. also Das Lied Moses Deuteronomium 32:1-43 und das Lehrgedicht Asaphs Psalm 78 (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, 104:5; Berlin, 1958), pp. 22-23, 43.

⁴⁸Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 227. Das Lied Moses, p. 24.

on the Song, W. F. Albright accepted this early date.⁴⁹ In Albright's view, the "intransigent monotheism" of the poet is best explained by the threat not only to Israel's political existence but to her religious integrity in the time of Samuel. Furthermore, Albright points to the use of repetition by the poet as an indication of its early date; thus he points to the repetition of sur ("rock") in vv. 30-31:

How can one man chase a thousand,
and two put a myriad to flight,
Unless their "rock" had sold them
and Yahweh had handed them over?
Truly our "Rock" is not like (their) rocks -
are not <our foes> the judges?⁵⁰

An example of the archaic imagery that helps to date the poem is the use of sur as a term for "God." Albright derives the word from zūru, "mountain" (cf. Aramaic tūrā and Ugaritic gūru) and explains that in the second millenium mountains were viewed as deities by the Syrians and Hittites.⁵¹ One cannot associate the poem with the age of Samuel with confidence, however. This theory depends upon

⁴⁹W. F. Albright, "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII," VT 9 (1959), 339-46.

⁵⁰Translation is Albright's. *Ibid.*, p. 345.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, p. 345, f.n. 4. Albright claims that examples of the absence of final matres lectionis suggest an early date, but he gives no examples.

the identification of the Philistines with the "no - people" of 32:21. The foreign oppressors, however, could as easily have been the Arameans of the mid-ninth century, the Assyrians of the eighth century, or the Babylonians of the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.⁵² At the same time, I see no reason to insist that the prophetic theme of judgment against "all Israel" that appears in the Song is necessarily later than Samuel. Wright contends that not until Ahijah, who proclaimed the division of the kingdom because of the sins of Solomon (I Kgs. 11:31ff) and especially Elijah, who denounces the people for disobeying the covenant (I Kgs. 19:14ff), does prophecy assume a critical role over against "all Israel." For this reason he suggests a ninth century date for the Song.⁵³ However, the followers of Samuel, who were responsible for the traditions in the anti-monarchical source, clearly preserve a memory of "Israel" under judgment for covenantal disobedience (7:3-6; cf. v. 6b, "We have sinned against Yahweh"; 12:15) and for her demand that a king rule her. I think it can be safely concluded that the Song of Moses originates from the early monarchical period. The time of Elijah would be a terminus ad quem.

It is apparent that the Gattung of the covenant lawsuit is reflected in the passages above with notable

⁵²Wright, "Lawsuit," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, p. 37.

⁵³Ibid., pp. 64-65.

consistency. The most significant feature in this structure, it appears to me, is the recital of Yahweh's deeds. This basis for the indictment is nothing other than the historical prologue of the covenant. The aptness of the term "covenant lawsuit" derives from this feature of the Gattung. The conclusion suggests itself that the milieu for covenant lawsuit is amphictyonic theology in which the covenant relation was central and for which Moses is the primary spokesman and guardian. This may explain why Deut. 32 is linked with Moses. It is not too much to assume that it was proclaimed in the cult by one who was a "prophet like unto Moses." And as Beyerlin has noted the reference to a prophet in Judges 6:7 is scarcely fortuitous, for the prophet was the supreme "office" in the traditions of the pre-monarchical period. G. Ernest Wright suggests that the covenant lawsuit is "a reformulation of the covenant-renewal theme"⁵⁴ born of an age that was forced to confront its sinfulness and the threat of disaster. It remains now to examine the materials in the anti-monarchical source for evidence of the covenant lawsuit employed by Samuel.

The most prominent example is 8:7-9, Yahweh's message to Samuel in the dispute over a king. The passage is an identifiable unit which begins with the phrase šm' bql

⁵⁴Wright, "Lawsuit," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, p. 65.

h'm (v. 7) and ends with the parallel phrase, šm' bqwlm. The fact that this phrase, used frequently for obedience to Yahweh in D and E,⁵⁵ is here employed of the people's demand heightens the irony that Yahweh is urging Samuel to acquiesce! The order of the passage differs considerably from the normative structure of the rib, but the major elements are present:

Indictment (7b). ". . . they have rejected me from being king over them." The enormity of this act is even more apparent when viewed in its covenant context: Israel the vassal has broken the covenant by rejecting her master.

Recital of Yahweh's Deeds (8). "According to all which they have done to me⁵⁶ from the day that I brought them out of Egypt until this day, they have rejected me and served other gods. Thus they do even to you." The indictment that is included in this verse is the most serious brought against the Israelites. The prohibition against worship of other gods is the central command in Israel's covenant relation with Yahweh (cf. Ex. 20:3; Deut. 6:4; Jos. 24:14).⁵⁷ It is not without significance that the pericope before us already

⁵⁵See above, p. 209.

⁵⁶For translation, cf. Chapter III, p. 98.

⁵⁷M. Noth, Exodus, tr. J. S. Bowden (Old Testament Library; Philadelphia, 1962; tr. of Das zweite Buch Mose, Exodus, Göttingen, 1959), p. 162. Alt defines the command in Deut. 6:4 to love Yahweh exclusively as the basic command of the Deuteronomic corpus. "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums," Kleine Schriften, II, 270. von Rad, Deuteronomy, pp. 56-57.

includes an indictment in v. 7b. The latter applies to the specific situation that confronts Israel. The inclusion of this indictment, especially at the beginning of the passage, illustrates the concrete application of the rib Gattung to a particular circumstance.

Witness (9a). "And now (w'ith) heed their voice, yet you shall be a witness against them. . . ." This begins the climactic portion of the pericope. The key word w'ith is frequent in covenant passages (cf. Ex. 19:5; Jos. 24:14a) and summons the hearer to face the direct meaning in the present of Yahweh's deeds of the past.⁵⁸ The witness in this case is not the natural elements nor even the divine council but Samuel himself.

Sentence (9b). ". . . you shall proclaim to them the custom(s) of the king who will reign over them." The sentence is more indirect than is customary in the rib, but it is nonetheless forceful. The outcome of Israel's sinful and arbitrary demand is clear, especially in light of the detailed list of evil practices in 8:11-18. The sentence, or the result of Israel's action, is similar to that in other examples of the rib in that a disruption of the order of things is implied; cf. the natural disasters set loose by the breach of covenant in Deut. 32:19-29.⁵⁹

⁵⁸Muilenburg, "Covenantal Formulations," pp. 352-54.

⁵⁹I owe the suggestion that the Gattung of this passage is a rib to Muilenburg, "Office," p. 92.

Considered as a whole the passage appears as a rîb. Nevertheless its form is unusual in that it climaxes in what is also a commission to Samuel. In a manner similar to that of the command laid upon the prophet (cf. Ex. 3:10; Is. 6:9), Samuel is told to go and proclaim to the people mspt hmlk (v. 9).

This presentation of the rîb occurs between Yahweh and Samuel. In 10:17-19, however, Samuel speaks directly to the people, in a scene that follows immediately on the events of 8:1-22. Samuel had dismissed the people following their demand for a king (8:22). He now convenes them at Mizpah, a city in his circuit as judge (7:16) and an important sanctuary for all Israel. It is the place of assembly for Israel in what appears a cultic setting (Jud. 21:5, 8, "What one is there of the tribes of Israel that did not come up to Yahweh to Mizpah?"; 7:5ff). Furthermore the terrible crime of the Benjaminites is brought to justice at Mizpah, where the Israelites "assembled as one man" (Jud. 20:1).⁶⁰ The cultic setting for the event in 10:17ff is suggested also by the term htysbw ("and they presented themselves"), a term whose meaning as a term of worship before God is well attested (cf. 3:10; 12:16;

⁶⁰Kraus, Worship, p. 173. Hans W. Hertzberg, "Mizpah," ZAW XLVII (1929), pp. 161-63, 166. Cf., however, J. Muilenburg, "The Literary Sources Bearing on the Question of Identification," Excavations at Tell en-Nasbeh, ed. C. C. McCown (Berkeley, 1947), pp. 27ff.

Ex. 14:13; Jos. 24:1b).⁶¹ The structure of the passage may be identified as follows:

Scene of the Trial (10:17-18). The solemnity of the occasion is apparent and all "sons of Israel" are assembled (š'q) by Samuel. Form-critically this is a feature that is notable in the example of the rīb from the Psalms (cf. Ps. 82:1).⁶²

Recital of Yahweh's Deeds (10:18b). Here Samuel speaks the word of Yahweh in setting forth the basis for His indictment of Israel. He is the prophetic messenger of Yahweh to the people. Hence, the familiar Botenformel is used: kh 'mr yhwh (cf. II Sam. 12:7b; I Kgs. 14:7; Jer. 22:30, among many examples). It may introduce an entire speech of judgment by the prophet or simply the announcement of judgment within the speech.⁶³ In connection with Samuel the Botenformel occurs only one other time (15:2). Nor are other elements of the prophetic Gattung included here, such as

⁶¹Harrelson, "Worship," 44-45.

⁶²Gunkel, op. cit., p. 365.

⁶³Claus Westermann, Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech, tr. Hugh Clayton White (Philadelphia, 1967; tr. of Grundformen prophetischer Rede, München, 1960), pp. 149-50. Cf. also H. G. Reventlow, "Prophetenamt und Mittleramt," ZTK LVIII (1961), 278-79. The Botenformel in prophetic speech of the Old Testament is one element among several that are closely paralleled in the speeches of the messengers of the god to the king in the Mari texts. Noth, "History and the Word of God in the Old Testament," Laws, pp. 183-87.

the Empfangsformel or the Befehl zu Reden.⁶⁴ Accordingly I am inclined to see it as a later addition to the text, possibly by those who refer to Samuel as a prophet in 3:20. Indictment (10:19a). "You have this day rejected (m'stm) your God who saved you from all your calamities and oppressors, and you have said, 'No!'⁶⁵ But a king place over us.'" The indictment is identical to that in the rib of 8:1-22, including the use of m's.

"Sentence" (10:19b). The climax of the pericope is marked by the key word, w'th. Furthermore it is clear that the choice of king will occur before Yahweh: htysbw lyny yhwh. . . No sentence is included. It is possible that an original rib has been amended so as to introduce the narrative of the choice of Saul by lot. If so, the pericope in the form of a rib may have existed independently. As a basic indictment against kingship, it would be applicable in many contexts. It may also be that in the mind of the author, the sentence amounted to life in the monarchy itself. This is at least the suggestion of the rib in chap. 8. The latter alternative is preferable since no other indication exists of deletion of a sentence.

It remains to consider one other passage that has been linked with the covenant lawsuit by both Beyerlin and Weiser. I refer to the account in 7:3-17, where Samuel

⁶⁴Reventlow, loc. cit.

⁶⁵For translation, cf. Chapter III, p. 101.

convenes an assembly of "all Israel" at Mizpah for a ritual activity and thereby secures deliverance from the Philistines. Weiser identifies two basic motifs in the account: that of Samuel as cultic intercessor and "Hüter der einstigen Jahwe-Kult-Tradition" on the one hand and the Philistine threat on the other.⁶⁶ The prominent role of the cult in these events, not only the burnt offering (v. 9) but also the unique confessional rite of water oblation (v. 6), suggests that Samuel is hardly a deliverer in the sense of a major judge (contra Noth).⁶⁷ The threat of a foreign oppressor, namely the Philistines, in 7:3-17 suggests a comparison with Deut. 32, where Yahweh uses a "no people" to threaten rebellious Israel (Deut. 32:21). Weiser accepts Eissfeldt's contention that the "no-people" of the Song are the Philistines. If so, then the oppressor is the same as in I Sam. 7. Just as significant, however, is the fact that in form and content the Song presupposes a cultic setting: direct address to the assembled Israelites (vv. 3, 6, 7, 14, 17, 18); call to praise of Yahweh (v. 3); accusation of apostasy (vv. 15-18). The mode of presentation differs considerably but the poem and the narrative have similar motifs. The recognition of Yahweh's absolute sufficiency and justice (Deut. 32:3ff) corresponds to the cry to "Serve Yahweh alone" in 7:4. The confession of sin by

⁶⁶Weiser, Samuel, p. 12.

⁶⁷Noth, Studien, p. 55.

the assembly at Mizpah (7:6) is clearly the goal of the rîb in Deut. 32.⁶⁸ The historical validity of I Sam. 7 lies in Samuel's response to the Philistine crisis:

Die Verbindung Samuels mit einem Sieg über die Philister wird wohl auf eine Tradition zurückgehen, nach der Samuel in ähnlicher Weise, wie das in Dt 32 geschieht, Jahwes Gericht über die Philister prophetisch angekündigt hat.⁶⁹

This does not mean that the pericope of judgment and confession in I Sam. 7 is a rîb, as is Deut. 32:1-29. The sin of the people is clear (v. 3), but it is not set forth as an indictment. Indeed it is most clearly expressed in confession form by the people themselves (v. 6b). Nor is there a recital of Yahweh's deeds. The most notable aspect of the pericope is the act of confession which involves the people's admission of guilt, the rite of pouring water and fasting in penitence (elsewhere mentioned only indirectly in Lam. 2:19), and the plea for intercession. Beyerlin has noted the similarity of this ceremony to the Sitz im Leben suggested for the rîb in Jud. 10:11b-16. In vv. 10, 15-16 we are told of the proclamation of the rîb to the people and of their confession of sin and pledge of renewed faithfulness (15-16a). This prompts God to relent (16b). A similar series of events is identifiable in I Sam. 7. Samuel proclaims the requirements for deliverance (vv. 3-4); the people confess their sin (v. 6); and God responds to Samuel's

⁶⁸Weiser, Samuel, pp. 19-20.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 21.

intercession by destroying the Philistines (vv. 7-10). The key words are identical: ht'nw ("we have sinned; cf. I Sam. 7:6); 'lhy hnkr ("foreign gods; cf. 7:3), a non-deuteronomic phrase; wy'bdw ("they served" (Yahweh); cf. 7:3).

Beyerlin concludes that the rib Gattung originated "in den Bussund Fastenfeiern der vorstaatlichen Jahweamphiktyonie. . . ." ⁷⁰

A similar rite is linked to Bethel in Jud. 20:26 and 21:2. Whereas these chapters are a late addition to the book, nevertheless it seems not unnatural that such a ceremony of lamentation would develop at the very beginnings of a "national" consciousness, no matter how tenuous. The early date of I Sam. 7 as part of the anti-monarchical source also suggests the provenance of the ceremony of lamentation. Apart from the question of a date for this cultic event, the significance of the observations of Weiser and Beyerlin is that the events of chap. 7 are closely associated with the rib. The milieu of the chapter is the proclamation of covenant obligation to a sinful people in a cultic setting. ⁷¹ Samuel, who stands at the

⁷⁰Beyerlin, "Rahmens," Tradition und Situation, p. 28. Beyerlin rests his argument in part upon a pre-monarchic date for Deut. 32, whose Gattung is reflected in the passages under his analysis.

⁷¹Weiser contends that the original narrative ends with v. 9 and that the account of victory over the Philistines is a secondary one. Weiser, Samuel, p. 21. Comparison with Judges 10:11ff suggests, however, that an account of Yahweh's mercy or deliverance is integral to the form:

center of this covenant ceremony as Israel's leader, is thus intimately linked with covenantal theology and with its proclamation and defense in the cult. He has at once judicial, cultic, and prophetic functions.⁷²

Another passage that is intimately connected to Gattungen surrounding the covenant and to Moses or the Mosaic office of covenant mediator is Samuel's speech in I Sam. 12. Similarities with chap. 7 not only suggest a common source but underscore the cultic setting of the passage. In both cases Samuel proclaims the covenant conditionals normative to Israel's existence (7:3ff; 12:13-15), leads the people to a confession of sin (7:6; 12:19), intercedes on their behalf (7:5; 12:23). The crisis here is not a political one as in chap. 7. Rather, the threat is to the covenant relation which exists between Yahweh and his people. But the motif of deliverance which follows the act of penitence is clear in both passages.⁷³ W. Richter notes that this pattern in which confession is the condition of deliverance occurs only three times, i.e., Judges 10:10ff and these two passages.⁷⁴

"... and he became indignant over the misery of Israel." (Jud. 10:16b) In I Sam. 7, the account of the conflict with the Philistines is radically portrayed as Yahweh's victory alone (7:10b). The victory is sure before the Israelites even muster (7:11).

⁷²Ibid., p. 21.

⁷³Ibid., p. 87.

⁷⁴Die Bearbeitungen des 'Retterbuches' in der Deuteronomischen Epoche (Bonn, 1964), p. 20.

The uniqueness of this practice suggests that the events narrated here occur at Mizpah, even as they do in chap. 7. This would also be expected if chap. 12 is the direct continuation of 10:17-21ab, 25a.⁷⁵ Apart from the evidence based on source analysis, it seems unlikely that the highly critical speech would be part of the joyous events of renewal at the close of chap. 11.⁷⁶

The significance of the passage with regard to the portrayal of Samuel lies in its overall structure, which suggests not only that it is a unity (contra Hylander, Seebass) but that Samuel is leading the Israelites in a renewal of the covenant in the manner of Moses and Joshua before him. In this respect the structure of the passage is more inclusive and central to covenant traditions than is chap. 7. It is precisely the covenant renewal Gattung, which is also identifiable in the proclamation of Moses (Ex. 19:3-6; E) and in that of Joshua (Jos. 24:1-25; E). The basic elements are the proclamation of Yahweh's saving deeds (Ex. 19:4; Jos. 24:2-13), the subsequent exhortation by the covenant mediator in terms of covenant conditionals (Ex. 19:5-6; Jos. 24:14-15), and the affirmative response of the people, as in Jos. 24:16-24.⁷⁷ The dynamic here is

⁷⁵Numerous scholars have located the speech at Gilgal, since the events of 11:14-15 occur there; cf. Thenius, op. cit., p. 46. Weiser, Samuel, p. 88. Muilenburg, "Covenantal Formulations," p. 360.

⁷⁶Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 97.

⁷⁷Muilenburg, "Covenantal Formulations," pp. 358-59.

cultic: In the first part, the mediator is "making present" the redemptive events of Israel's past in order that the Israelites may participate in them anew. The second and third sections comprise the cultic obligations and response of commitment on the part of the people.

These same structural elements are used by the author in I Sam. 12. The passage reflects three major divisions: vv. 1-6 in which Samuel defends himself; vv. 7-15 which is the heart of the covenantal Gattung; and vv. 16-25 wherein Yahweh's miraculous deed occasions the people's confession. It is with the second of these sections that the covenantal structure per se begins. In vv. 7-12 (the "covenantal order of the kingdom"), Samuel reviews Yahweh's saving deeds in the exodus (v. 8) and the conquest (vv. 9-11). This review concludes with reference to the establishment of a monarchy, vv. 12-13. Such a review of the basis for covenant is parallel to that in Ex. 19:4-5 and Jos. 24:2-13. This is followed by the covenant conditionals, vv. 14-15. These are central to covenant proclamation, as is suggested by the form of Ex. 19:3-6 and Jos. 24.⁷⁸ This second portion of the covenant renewal begins with the key word, w'th, "and now." This term also occurs at the beginning of section one (v. 7) and section three (v. 16). This fact points to the conscious structure of the passage and to the basic cultic assumption that in proclamation, Yahweh's deeds

⁷⁸See above, p. 171.

of redemption and judgment are made present. The proclamation of covenant conditionals by Moses in Ex. 19:5 also begins with this term.⁷⁹

Given the covenantal formulations of this chapter, how are we to understand the absence of an affirmation on the part of the people, as in Jos. 24:16ff? What is the meaning of vv. 16-25 of Samuel's speech? On the one hand, they speak of an event foreign to covenant renewal: a massive demonstration of Yahweh's judgment over the people (and the king) because they demanded a monarchy. This is followed by the Israelites' confession of their sin. On the other hand, the passage is structured according to a covenantal form: It begins with w'th htysbw ("and now, present yourselves"), which parallels the key words of the opening section of the chapter (vv. 1-6). Even more importantly the passage centers on the witness of the people: "See this great event, which Yahweh will perform before our eyes!" Such witness is central to covenant renewal, and the same motif appears in Ex. 19 and Jos. 24.⁸⁰ The inquiry is advanced significantly with the observation that since this final section of the chapter has witness as its dominant motif, it parallels the opening verses of the chapter in which the people are called upon to witness to Samuel's innocence,

⁷⁹Muilenburg, "Covenantal Formulations," p. 352.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 363. That the people are witnesses, against themselves, is no less unusual than in Jos. 24:22. McCarthy, op. cit., p. 147.

in a narrative which reflects a well-established Gattung. In the manner of Hebrew thought, the ending parallels the beginning. But the parallelism is antithetical: in vv. 1-6, the people are witness to Samuel's innocence; in vv. 16-25, they are witness to their own guilt. Thus, the elements of the rib here present are particularly appropriate. In short, the author has altered the pattern of a covenant renewal ceremony to emphasize that Samuel alone stands blameless before Yahweh.

3. Similar Functions of Moses and Samuel

In his study of the "mediator of salvation in the Old Testament and the ancient Orient," Josef Scharbert describes in detail the portrayal of Moses in the different Pentateuchal sources and identifies the various functions attributed to him.⁸¹ His analysis of those figures who were mediators between God and Israel includes a discussion of various Israelite leaders in the Deuteronomic historical work (i.e., Deuteronomy through II Kings).

In his discussion of Samuel, Scharbert points out the similarities with Moses. Samuel functions as a priest both at Shiloh (3:2) and at the local sanctuary at Ramah (9:12-24). As a prophet he is the one who proclaims the will of God to the Israelites. After the manner of Moses, he intercedes on behalf of the people before Yahweh (7:8). Samuel

⁸¹Scharbert, op. cit., pp. 81-89.

stands apart from the people, however. He is not involved in the sinful desire for a king. Thus, he can proclaim the sacred law (10:25; 12:14-15) and call down thunder and rain so that Israel "shall know and see that (her) wickedness is great. . . ." (12:17). In his position over against the people Samuel appears as Moses before him. Moses' intercession for the people (Ex. 32:30-33; Num. 14:13-20) is based on his position over against the people. Only twice does Moses use the pronoun "we" in referring to himself and the people before Yahweh (Ex. 10:17; Num. 12:11). Far more typical is Moses' comment in Ex. 32:30, "You have sinned a great sin. And now I will go up to Yahweh. Perhaps I can make atonement for your sin."⁸²

In order to compare the functions of Moses in the Elohist and Deuteronomy with those of Samuel in the anti-monarchical source in detail, I have set forth the references for each. The discussion is organized under four

⁸²Ibid., pp. 87-88. While Moses' position over against the people is clear in E, the picture is a mixed one in Deuteronomy. In Deut. 9:25-29 Moses tells of his intercession before Yahweh for forty days and forty nights. He pleaded with Yahweh not to destroy his people. Clearly he is not involved in their sin: "do not regard the stubbornness of this people, or their wickedness, or their sin" (v. 27b). A similar perspective is apparent in Deut. 1:37 ("Yahweh was angry with me also on your account. . .") and in Moses' plea to Yahweh that he might enter the Promised Land (3:27-28). By contrast Moses' death in Deut. 32:50-52 is explained by his sin at Meribah where he did not trust in Yahweh (Num. 20:12-13; 27:14). The passage in Deut. 32:50-52 is part of the framework of the Song of Moses. Because it differs with the versions in Deut. 1:37 and 3:27-28 and agrees with the Priestly accounts in Num. 20:12-13 and 27:14 that Moses died before reaching Canaan because of his own sin, the verses may not be properly considered Deuteronomic. von Rad, Deuteronomy, pp. 190-21, 200-01.

categories: priest, prophet, judge, and leader of Israel. I have not put the weight of the comparison upon the terms, however. In each case the comparison has been made between the deeds of the two Israelite leaders, since the title of "priest" or "prophet" or "judge" is fluid and subject to varying definitions.

Priest. The priestly tasks of Moses are not frequent in E and D. Nevertheless they indicate his association with the cult. In Ex. 24:3-8, he concludes the acts of covenant between Yahweh and Israel by constructing an altar and leading the people in offering of burnt sacrifices and peace offerings. Moses also anoints the tabernacle and its altars (Ex. 35:12ff). In what may be a priestly act of ordination, he commissions the elders to prophesy by sharing the ru'ah which rested on him (Num. 11:24-25). Although the festivals are not to be connected with Moses historically, he is portrayed in Ex. 23:15-16⁸³ as instituting the festivals of Unleavened Bread and Harvest and Ingathering.⁸⁴

⁸³I would follow Driver in identifying the passage, which is part of the Covenant Code, as Elohist. Driver, Introduction, pp. 31-32.

⁸⁴The priestly functions of Moses are more prominent in P. According to Num. 16:43-50 Yahweh intends to destroy his people because of their rebellion. Moses oversees the incense offering in a rite of expiation, and Yahweh "repents." In Lev. 8 the commands of Yahweh set forth in Ex. 29 are carried out by Moses as he ordains Aaron and his sons. Moses washes and dresses them and anoints them with oil. Then he offers the bull of the sin offering, the ram of the burnt offering, and the ram of ordination. After Aaron and his sons have remained at the tent of meeting seven days (Lev. 8:35-36), Moses directs them in sacrifices of atonement (Lev. 9).

In a similar way Samuel functions as priest in the anti-monarchical source, although this role is minimal. The closest parallel with Moses occurs in 7:3-17. As Moses offered sacrifice for a sinful people at the "affair of Korah," so Samuel offers a burnt offering on behalf of Israel at Mizpah. It was also Samuel's responsibility to build an altar to Yahweh as he does at his home in Ramah (7:17). This reflects the Mosaic practice recorded in Ex. 24:4: ". . . And he rose early in the morning, and built an altar at the foot of the mountain, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel."

In a more indirect, although no less noteworthy, manner the narrative of Samuel's call in the anti-monarchical source suggests his priestly role. On two occasions his training as a priest is specifically mentioned. In 2:11 and 3:1 it is said that "Samuel was ministering to Yahweh before Eli." In 2:19, Hannah sends appropriate garments to her son, for his duties in the temple (cf. Ex. 28:4).⁸⁵ His call is, of course, placed in the context of the fall of the priestly house of Eli. It would appear that Samuel is henceforth to be Eli's successor at Shiloh, where the priest is responsible for the annual offering of sacrifices (1:3, 7; 2:13ff).

In these chapters Samuel appears as a man who has been associated with the sanctuary from his youth, who has grown up and gained his experience in the priestly

⁸⁵Budde, Samuel, p. 20. Hertzberg, I & II Samuel, p. 35.

service, and who is destined to become in reality the true priest in Israel. He succeeds to his office, however, only through the revelation of the word accorded to him. In this way he unites the priestly office with the prophetic vocation.⁸⁶

Prophet.

The reference in the call narrative to Samuel as a prophet (3:20) suggests the relation to Moses' position as prophet in Israel. This prophetic role attributed to Moses stands at the center of the traditions surrounding Moses in E and D. As already indicated Moses' prophetic role is a reflection of his "face to face" confrontation with Yahweh (Ex. 33:7-11; Num. 12:5-8) and his singular activities as intercessor for the people.⁸⁷

In addition to those prophetic tasks of Moses discussed in Chapter IV, several other events underscore this particularly significant role which Moses played according to E and D. Moses' commission as prophet is to deliver Israel from bondage. He calls down plagues upon Egypt (Ex. 7:14-12:37), and in the wilderness wandering he is able to save his people from thirst by miraculous deeds (Ex. 17:1b-7). He intercedes frequently to save Israel from Yahweh's wrath: at Mt. Horeb (Ex. 32:11-14), at Taberah (Num. 11:1-3; Deut. 9:25-29), on the way to Edom (Num. 21:4-9). He is confronted by Yahweh "face to face" and receives his

⁸⁶Hertzberg, I & II Samuel, p. 43.

⁸⁷See above, pp. 162-68.

commands and judgments on Israel. The word of Yahweh clearly rests with him, whether in the case of covenant law (Ex. 20:1-23:19), or in a particular command such as the commission of elders (Num. 11:16-18), or in the allotment of land to Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh (Num. 32:33-42). In a manner unique among the legal pericopes of the Old Testament, Moses proclaims the law in Deuteronomy. Here the context appears to be covenant renewal, as indicated by the structure of the book and the prescription in Deut. 31:9ff for the reading of the law at the festival of booths. The prophet Moses is repeatedly portrayed therefore as the proclaimer of covenant renewal.⁸⁸

Several functions that are attributed to Samuel in the anti-monarchical source constitute parallels to these actions of Moses. Most notable perhaps is the proclamation of covenant renewal in I Sam. 12. The recital of Yahweh's deeds and the stipulations of conditions for the covenant relation closely parallel Moses' proclamations in Ex. 19:3-6.⁸⁹ The force of Samuel's speech is clearly directed toward the present crisis of the adoption of a monarchy (cf. vv. 13, 19). Furthermore the presentation leads to a confession of sin by the Israelites. Nevertheless the larger context of the passage is that of covenant

⁸⁸Kraus, Die prophetische Verkündigung, passim. Cf. especially p. 11, Moses "ist im Alten Testament ohne Zweifel das Urbild des charismatisch-prophetischen Übermittlers und Verkündigers des apodiktischen Gottesrechts."

⁸⁹See above, pp. 260-62.

renewal.⁹⁰

In a manner directly related to the references to Samuel in Jer. 15:1 and Ps. 99:6, the prophet is portrayed as an intercessor. As Moses responds to the people's needs and pleads their case before God, so also does Samuel intercede for Israel when she is threatened by the Philistines (7:8ff). In another passage that closely parallels this, Samuel pledges never to cease to pray (pl1) for Israel (12:23).⁹¹

Since intercession lies at the heart of Moses' functions (cf. Ex. 20:18-21), it is especially significant that Samuel, too, is the one who pleads Israel's case before her God in the anti-monarchical source. In the narrative of Num. 21:4-9 Israel is rebellious against Yahweh because of the miserable conditions in the wilderness. Yahweh smites them, and the people repent (v. 7). They plea to Moses to intercede: htpl1 'l-yhwh ("pray to Yahweh"). Moses does so, and Yahweh provides the means to turn away the plague. This sequence is similar to that in 12:18ff. Here the lives of the Israelites are not threatened, but they are clearly under judgment and are threatened with punishment. The plea to Samuel is identical with that in Num. 21:7: htpl1... 'l-yhwh 'lhyk. The author does not say that Samuel

⁹⁰Weiser, Samuel, pp. 83ff.

⁹¹The parallel is even more explicit in some Greek MSS; cf. Chapter III, p. 96.

prays for Israel, but he does assure them of the steadfastness of God's love. It is clearly intimated that Samuel as intercessor and mediator of covenant law (cf. vv. 20-21) holds the key to his people's well-being.

As befits the Mosaic prophet (Ex. 20:18-21; Num. 12:5-8), Samuel receives the word of God directly according to the anti-monarchical source. At Shiloh, he receives the prophecy of judgment (3:11). At Ramah, Yahweh directs him to grant the people their request and to proclaim to them the ways of kings (8:7-9, 22). Furthermore, Samuel's petitions to Yahweh are always granted, as in the Philistine crisis (7:5-11) and in the instance where Yahweh visits a sign of judgment upon the people (12:18). The fact, which is consistently maintained throughout the Samuel-Saul narratives, that Yahweh speaks only to Samuel, stands in notable contrast to Saul's isolation from the divine word. Prior to his war with the Philistines, Saul beseeches Yahweh as to the outcome of the battle (14:36ff), but Yahweh "did not answer him that day" (14:37b). The contrast between the two men before Yahweh is underscored in the strange account of Saul's desperate counsel with the medium of Endor (28:6ff). Saul had inquired of Yahweh, but received no answer (v. 6). Accordingly, he calls Samuel from the dead to "tell me what I shall do" (v. 15).

Judge.

Moses and Samuel both appear to be closely associated

with the laws which govern Israel's life, especially in the cult. In Ex. 18:13-27 Moses has taken upon himself to judge all disputes which arise among the Israelites. The burden of such a task is too great, and Jethro suggests a division of labor. Moses assumes responsibility for cases in the sacral sphere. It is he who shall "inquire of God," proclaim His statutes (h_qy) and decisions (twrty), and present cases before God (v. 19). His task is to prescribe to Israel the way of life that she must walk (v. 20) and judge the unusually difficult cases (v. 22; cf. also Deut. 1:17). Cases in the civil realm are to be delegated to faithful men, who will rule over groups of Israelites and decide minor cases.

This passage appears to be an etiological account, since it makes clear at an early stage in Israel's life a practical division of labor which we may assume formed part of the societal pattern after the Conquest.⁹² If two different legal offices are referred to here, the question must be raised whether the Mosaic office is mentioned elsewhere. Noth suggests that this office may be that of the "minor" judge in Jud. 10 and 12.⁹³

⁹²Noth, Exodus, pp. 149-50. Gressmann, op. cit., pp. 173-76.

⁹³See below, pp. 285ff. Curiously the only example of Moses' conduct as judge in difficult cases occurs in the Priestly source. In Num. 27:1-11, he receives the plea of the daughters of Zelophehad for a share of the inheritance (v. 3). He brings their case before Yahweh at the tent of meeting (v. 2). Similarly Moses rules on the matter of inter-marriage that arises as an extension of the case of the daughters (Num. 36).

Moses is portrayed repeatedly as the one who receives and proclaims Yahweh's law to Israel. The most notable passages are those already discussed under the heading "prophet":⁹⁴ He gives Israel the laws of the covenant (Ex. 20:2-23:19) and also sets them forth in proclamation and exhortation in Deut. 5-26. Klostermann first called attention to the parenetic nature of the laws of Deuteronomy, an observation that von Rad has elaborated and used as the basis for recovering the Sitz im Leben of the material.⁹⁵ The task of proclamation and interpretation of the law is specifically assigned to Moses in the Elohist source. According to Ex. 18:20, Moses is to "teach them the statutes and the laws and make them know the way they should go and what they must do."⁹⁶ An important aspect of covenant or treaty-making in the Ancient Near East consisted of recording the laws, as well as provision for its regular proclamation.⁹⁷

⁹⁴See above, p. 267.

⁹⁵D. August Klostermann, Der Pentateuch, Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte (second edition; Leipzig, 1907), pp. 344-47. von Rad, Studies, p. 15.

⁹⁶Scharbert, op. cit., pp. 91-92. In spite of the fact that Scharbert links this role with E in particular, the function of receiving the law also appears in J and P, although there is no emphasis upon its interpretation and proclamation. In Ex. 34:27, 32-34 (J) Moses receives the decalogue. In several places the priestly writer portrays Moses as the recipient of the law, e.g., Lev. 1-7 (sacrificial law), Lev. 17-26 (Holiness Code), Num. 15 (sacrifices), and Num. 28-30 (sacrifices for various days and months; the laws concerning vows).

⁹⁷McCarthy, op. cit., p. 3, 81-82.

As judge, Moses carries out these duties at Sinai (Ex. 24:4). In Deuteronomy the emphasis is characteristically upon the provision that the law be periodically read, whether by the king (Deut. 17:19) or by the Levites before all Israel every seven years (Deut. 31:10).

The portrayal of Samuel in the anti-monarchical source suggests quite clearly that he is a judge after the manner of Moses, serving the cause of sacred law as prescribed for the successors of Moses in Ex. 18:13-27.

Samuel is called a judge and his circuit is prescribed in 7:15-16. Although his actual functions at Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah are not described, it is surely significant for his relation to sacred and covenant law that these villages were each important cult centers.⁹⁸ His activities at Mizpah are indicated by the narrative itself.

"And Samuel judged the people of Israel at Mizpah" (7:6b). Both the context and the use of the covenant conditional in 7:3 make it clear that Samuel is calling the people to judgment under the laws of Yahweh's covenant. In a word, he is performing the Mosaic function of making "them know the way in which they must walk and what they must do" (Ex. 18:20b). Again at Mizpah, Samuel concludes the choice of king by 1) telling the people the duties of kingship, 2) recording them in a book, 3) depositing it "before Yahweh," i.e., in the sanctuary. Although these

⁹⁸Kraus, Worship, pp. 146-65, 173.

laws may have been limited to those governing the king alone, these acts of Samuel closely parallel Moses' procedure at the conclusion of ratification of the covenant (Ex. 24:4). They also echo the command of Moses in Deut. 17 that the king will record the law and read it (cf. also Deut. 31:9, 24).

It is not explicitly stated that Samuel bears the Mosaic commission to judge the difficult cases that confront the Israelites. Nevertheless one might justifiably assume that the demand for a king in 8:1-22 is an analogous situation. Samuel is presented with the petition at Ramah (v. 5). He immediately takes it to Yahweh as Moses did in the cases brought to him. The decision is made, and Yahweh commands Samuel to make it known to the people. He immediately does so.

Finally, it is apparent that Samuel is frequently associated in the anti-monarchical source with the ordinances and motifs that comprise sacred law under the covenant. His own defense of his service to Israel (12:3-5) is based upon covenant law, as Weiser has shown.⁹⁹ The prophetic task of covenant renewal as well as the proclamation of covenant conditionals in 7:3 and 12:14-15 are central to covenant ideology. In 15:1-35, Samuel functions as one of the later prophets in rejecting Saul's sacrifice (vv. 12, 22-23).¹⁰⁰ The specific issue is a violation of the

⁹⁹See above, p. 192.

¹⁰⁰Albright, Samuel, p. 17. Cf. Weiser, "I Samuel 15," p. 22, who argues that the motif of obedience dominates the entire account.

law of herem, however. Samuel's judgment is clear, and he immediately proceeds to fulfill the law, as proclaimed by Moses in Deut. 7:24; 20:13: All captives and booty taken in war must be devoted to Yahweh.

Leader of Israel.

The sum of Moses' functions is clearly his unequalled leadership of "all Israel." Particularly in times of crisis, he leads his people, as in the deliverance from the Egyptian army (Ex. 14:11-31) and in battles with those nations who would destroy Israel or hinder her journey, such as the Amalekites (Ex. 17:8-16).¹⁰¹ In Num. 14:39-45 Moses warns his people against certain defeat, but they insist on entering the hill country where the Amalekites and Canaanites defeat them "even to Hormah." Moses selects men for legal service (Ex. 18:13ff) and gives the gift of prophecy to the elders (Num. 11:24-25). He clearly has responsibility for Israel's civil and religious affairs.

As leader in the holy war, Moses carefully observes the command of herem by destroying all booty and captives after the battle with the Aradites (Num. 21:2-3).¹⁰² We

¹⁰¹I see no reason to deny the account to the Elohist. Driver, Introduction, p. 30. The curse against the Amalekites (v. 14) also appears in Deuteronomy (Deut. 25:17-19), which suggests that the tradition originates in the north.

¹⁰²Eissfeldt does not include Num. 21:1-3 in the Elohist source, although the account of the people's rebellion in 21:3-9 is attributed to E. I see no reason to deny that the former is from E, since the literary style of the two passages is similar and the narrative proceeds smoothly.

are told that the followers of Sihon (Deut. 2:34) and of Og (Deut. 3:3) were also devoted to Yahweh by Moses.

In the anti-monarchical source, Samuel is undisputed leader of the tribes of Israel, although the material relating his activities as Israel's leader is scarcely as extensive as the traditions ascribed to Moses in E and D. His leadership comes not only at a time when Israel is threatened by external dangers at the hand of the Philistines. He also presides at the birth of a new political life for Israel. An important characteristic of the traditions in the anti-monarchical source is their emphasis upon Samuel's important role in both areas.

Samuel reminds the people that they must be obedient to Yahweh if they are to be delivered from the Philistines (7:3-4). The Israelites acknowledge their sins of apostasy, and Samuel calls upon Yahweh for deliverance. The Philistines are vanquished, and the author claims that "the hand of Yahweh was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel" (7:13b). While the claim is clearly exaggerated, it illustrates the role of Samuel as the victorious and capable leader of Israel. This portrayal of Samuel in the anti-monarchical source is no less apparent in the narrative of the establishment of the monarchy.

In an event which acknowledges Samuel's leadership in Israel, the elders come to him and discuss his successor (8:4-5). He is old, and his sons are unfit for service for

they have not walked in the ways of their father. Therefore, the elders propose that a king succeed the priest-judge. As Moses discharged his responsibility to appoint leaders over Israel, Samuel in the anti-monarchical source presides over the selection of the king (10:17-21) in spite of his conviction that the kingship is evil.

Samuel's role in the events of 15:4-8, 12-14, 20-23, 29-30a, 31a, 32-34 is that of both prophet and leader of Israel in holy war. Not only does he demand that the command of harem be observed, but he proceeds to execute Agag himself (vv. 32-33). In the newly established order of the monarchy, probably this task would have been the king's. Thus an unknown prophet rebukes Ahab for sparing Ben-hadad (I Kgs. 20:42-43). Apparently Samuel recalls his own earlier leadership over the tribes of Israel and proceeds to fulfill the law of holy war. At issue was the faithfulness of the kingdom to the demands of a strict "amphictyonic" theology. Samuel acts as the messenger and guardian of this faith, whose unconditional requirements upon both king and people must be honored.¹⁰³

My discussion of the functions attributed to Samuel as priest, prophet, judge, and leader of Israel in the anti-monarchical source has attempted to point out parallels with the role of Moses. Although these parallels are

¹⁰³Weiser, "I Samuel 15," pp. 24-25.

more notable in the anti-monarchical source, parallels with Mosaic functions are also evident in the other traditions concerning Samuel, i.e., 9:1-10:16, 22-24; 11:1-15; 13:8-15. The account of Saul's search for asses only to find a kingship reveals Samuel not only as a local seer (9:5-10) but as a priest at the high place of Ramah. Samuel presides over the meal and carefully arranges for Saul's place of honor (9:22-24). The intent of the narrative is clearly to introduce the issue of kingship in the context of worship of Yahweh and perhaps in the context of Israel's covenant relation with her God since the meal here calls to mind the communal meal over which Moses presided at the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai (cf. Ex. 24:11b, ". . . they beheld God, and ate and drank.").¹⁰⁴ Although Samuel's jurisdiction includes only the area around Ramah (cf. 9:6-7, where Saul appears not to have heard of him), nevertheless he becomes a leader of importance to all Israel by virtue of Yahweh's commission to anoint a nagid (v. 16). Samuel anoints Saul (10:1) and prophesies the signs which will appear to the new leader (vv. 2-8).

In yet another account of Saul's anointment (10:22-24) Samuel is once more the central figure. He is responsive to the desires of the people, but he is also the spokesman for Yahweh (cf. v. 24a, "Do you see him whom Yahweh has

¹⁰⁴Weiser, Samuel, p. 57.

chosen?"). Samuel remains a leader of Israel even after Saul has become king and demonstrated his ability to deliver Israel from foreign oppression by his victory in the battle of Jabesh-Gilead.¹⁰⁵ After Saul's momentous victory Samuel leads the people to the cult sanctuary of Gilgal where Israel sacrifices before Yahweh and the kingship is renewed (11:14-15 LXX).

Samuel's position as the chief priest in Israel is strongly emphasized in another incident at Gilgal, viz. in the rebuke of Saul in 13:7b-15. The verses constitute a strange interruption in a battle narrative which fails to mention Samuel at all. The account is not a clear rebuke of Saul since his position is portrayed sympathetically. With his followers leaving him, he had no choice but to proceed with the sacrifice (13:11). The account is anticipated in 10:8 where the command is given to wait seven days. An editor probably sought to relate Saul's demise to the rise of Yahweh's chosen "prince," David.¹⁰⁶ He uses yet another illustration of the tension that frustrated the relation of Samuel and Saul. Samuel's insistence that Saul should have waited for him regardless of the

¹⁰⁵The account in 11:1-11 is probably very early. It is an insert in the brief episode of Saul's detractors (10:26-27; 11:12-13). The editor seeks to demonstrate that those who doubt Yahweh's choice of king are undeniably wrong. Hertzberg, I & II Samuel, p. 94.

¹⁰⁶Budde, Samuel, pp. 85-86. Cf. also Hertzberg, I & II Samuel, p. 94.

circumstances indicates that Samuel assumed sole priestly prerogatives. Saul's attempt to offer sacrifice is portrayed as royal usurpation of the priest's role.

The preceding discussion of literary affinities, form-critical parallels, and Mosaic functions that Samuel performs leads to the conclusion that the portrayal of Samuel, especially in the anti-monarchical source, presents this leader of the pre-monarchic period as a second Moses. Samuel unites the norms of Israel's past with the needs of her future,¹⁰⁷ as Moses did again and again in the face of repeated crises. He is a new Moses for a new age. In the scope of his activities he defies description as simply a prophet, or a priest, or a judge. One motif that is present in virtually all the traditions surrounding Samuel is that of the covenant, both in terms of its ideology and of its Gattungen. Therefore Samuel could be called a covenant mediator, whose "office" is prescribed in Ex. 20:19-21 and Deut. 18:15-18 and whose predecessors are Moses and Joshua. Hans Kraus limits the term to one who preserves, proclaims and interprets the apodictic law of the covenant in those ceremonies of renewal which appear to lie behind passages such as Deut. 27; 31:10-12, and Jos. 24. He suggests that Samuel is one of those who succeeded Moses in such a role.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷Weiser, Samuel, p. 95.

¹⁰⁸Kraus, Die prophetische Verkündigung, pp. 4-5, 23. Cf. also A. Alt, "The Origins of Israelite Law," Essays, pp. 125ff., on whom Kraus depends.

Scharbert goes beyond this by viewing Samuel as one who not only transmits, or proclaims, Yahweh's word and will but also as one who intercedes for Israel before her God. Samuel is portrayed in the traditions as a figure "like unto Moses," who combines the varied functions of priest, prophet, judge, and leader in one person.¹⁰⁹ In addition it must not be overlooked that Samuel is an Ephraimite (1:1) as was Joshua before him and thus from the northern tribes where the amphictyonic traditions were especially prominent and the role of Moses normative. The prominence of Moses in E and D has been noted in the discussion of the major themes of the two northern sources. Furthermore, Samuel is associated with the cult center of Shiloh, as Joshua was before him (Jos. 18:1).¹¹⁰

4. The Historical Samuel

In the foregoing discussion I have made no attempt to speak of the historical Samuel, as distinct from the traditions that have been preserved in the anti-monarchical source. A firm conclusion on this question is difficult to attain, if not impossible. Nevertheless an attempt may be useful and instructive, especially since it bears on the related question of the controversy between Samuel and Saul.

¹⁰⁹Scharbert, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-118.

¹¹⁰Muilenburg, "The 'Office,'" p. 91.

It may be legitimate to proceed by identifying those aspects of the portrayal of Samuel in I Sam. 1-15 that are consistently represented regardless of the source in the text. In so doing a minimal picture will appear, apart from the embellishments of redactors who sought to enlarge the recollection of Samuel for their own purposes, or those on the other hand who sought to detract from the Samuel traditions. In this respect Samuel is consistently associated with the cult, i.e., with the practice of public worship in Israel, which occurred at the sanctuary cities.

The circumstances of Samuel's birth are narrated against a background of annual pilgrimage to the temple at Shiloh (1:1-2:26). Samuel's call occurs at a cultic site, namely the ark at Shiloh (3:3). The cultic setting of the events in which Samuel next appears is unusually explicit. He assembles the people at Mizpah (7:5) and leads them in a unique rite of penitence (7:6). In order to intercede for deliverance from the Philistines, he offers a "sucking lamb" as a burnt sacrifice (7:9). In an account from a different source, he is the priest at the high place of Ramah where he serves as host to Saul in a cultic meal (9:13, 22). The choice of Saul by lot (10:17-26) may not be considered an act of worship. Nevertheless it occurs at the cult center of Mizpah and is performed "before Yahweh" (10:19b, 25a).

Samuel also functions as leader in Israel's worship

at Gilgal, where the kingship is renewed "before Yahweh" and peace offerings are made (11:14-15). The setting for Samuel's speech in chap. 12 is not given, but the sign of judgment upon the people occurs when Samuel "calls upon Yahweh" (vv. 17-18). Both incidents of Saul's rejection (13:7b-15 and 15:22-23) occur at Gilgal and involve Samuel's role in the cult. On the one hand Samuel insists on his right to offer sacrifices, and on the other he fulfills the command of herem.

It would appear that Samuel's role in Israel centered in the events of the cult. In this sphere, Samuel recalls for Israel the implications and requirements of her life before God. Not only does he intercede on her behalf, but he proclaims to a sinful people the covenantal obligations which bind her to Yahweh.¹¹¹

The relation of the tribes of Israel to Yahweh was not a vague and undefined one. It received articulation in the laws of the covenant which governed virtually all aspects of Israel's life. The volume of legal material contained in the Pentateuch, as well as the indications that Israel's covenant with her God was modelled after the form of a treaty suggest the appropriateness of Noth's observation that Israel's uniqueness consisted of the sovereignty of the law of God over her life.¹¹² Thus, it should not

¹¹¹Weiser, Samuel, pp. 92-93.

¹¹²M. Noth, "Das Amt des 'Richters Israels,'" Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet, eds. Walter Baumgartner et al. (Tübingen, 1950), p. 414.

be surprising that a second factor that is notably consistent in the Samuel traditions is the leader's intimate connection with the "law of God."¹¹³ The relation of Samuel to the law was elaborated in the discussion of his role as "judge" and need only be briefly reviewed here.

After the manner of Moses, which is described in Ex. 18:13-27, Samuel represents the case of the people before God, whether in the face of Philistine attack or in the dispute over a king. He also makes them know "the statutes of God," as in the form of covenant conditionals (7:3; 12:14-15). He relies on the laws of the Covenant Code in defending his performance as Israel's leader, and he employs the Gattung of the rib to proclaim Yahweh's judgment on His disobedient people. The Gattung of 12:1-25 suggests that Samuel is leading Israel in a renewal of her covenant with Yahweh. The obligations of this covenant are summarized in the command to "fear Yahweh and serve him and hearken to his voice. . . ." (12:14).

The most significant text concerning Samuel's relation to the covenant law is also the briefest: "Then Samuel told the people the law of the kingship and he wrote it in a book and laid it up before Yahweh" (10:25a). Here Samuel clearly proclaims the law and demonstrates that the king, as any Israelite, is subject to Yahweh's sovereign

¹¹³By this term I refer not only to specific ordinances but to the covenantal themes and Gattungen which reflect the larger setting of the laws.

authority. The fact that the king is subject to the law helps to explain why Samuel acted so promptly to censure Saul and fulfill the commandment in the dispute over the herem.¹¹⁴

The conclusion is warranted that Samuel was a judge within the cult of the amphictyony. His role appears therefore as that of charismatic lawgiver and defender of the covenant theology that lay at the heart of the amphictyonic alliance.¹¹⁵ In his essay on Jud. 10:1-5; 12:7-15, Noth contends that the "minor" judges listed in these passages were connected with the tribal sanctuary and responsible for the preservation and application of the law, including cultic law. The fact that the office of "minor" judge is the only one known to us from the pre-monarchical period indicates the importance of the law in the life of the amphictyony.¹¹⁶ Noth suggests that the office may well have continued into the period of the monarchy, but he offers no evidence for this.

Even for the pre-monarchical period, the evidence is fragmentary. The passages in Jud. 10:1-5 and 12:7-15 are only parts of larger lists that no longer exist, according to

¹¹⁴Wildberger, "Samuel," pp. 464-65.

¹¹⁵Kraus, Die prophetische Verkündigung, p. 23. Bright, History, p. 166. "We may be sure that Samuel more than any other labored to keep the amphictyonic tradition alive."

¹¹⁶Noth, "Das Amt," p. 404.

Noth.¹¹⁷ This must certainly be true if the role of such a judge was as prominent in Israel as appears likely. In view of the fact that only partial evidence exists concerning this early office, it should not be assumed as does Noth that one judge served at a time. He suggests that each tribe in turn provided a judge at the sanctuary. This official may have been chosen by lot.¹¹⁸ If more were known, we perhaps would see that several judges functioned concurrently among the tribes.

The text in Jud. 10:1-5 and 12:7-15 is surprisingly brief in view of the suggested importance of such an office. Nothing is indicated of the judge's functions except that he "judged Israel."¹¹⁹ Noth does not limit his argument to these passages, however. In Deut. 17:8-13 a further description of the amphictyonic judge is given. The judge sat in judgment on difficult cases (Deut. 17:8) and his word was absolutely binding (v. 11b). The passage makes clear that

¹¹⁷Ibid., pp. 414-15.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 408.

¹¹⁹The reference to each judge is a brief, standardized form in which only the names and numbers differ with each judge: "After him (Name) arose. He judged Israel . . . years. He died and was buried at (Name)." Noth denies that such a brief statement contradicts the importance of the office. "Was im Rahmen dieses Schemas auftritt, beschränkt sich so knapp und schlicht auf einige konkrete Mitteilungen von Namen und Zahlen, die aus irgendeiner Theorie gar nicht ableitbar sind, dass kaum ein anderer Schluss übrigbleibt als der, dass wir hier eine Überlieferung über eine geschichtliche Institution vor uns haben, die dann wohl der Frühzeit Israels vor der Staatenbildung angehören muss." Ibid., p. 408.

the judge presided at the cult sanctuary (v. 8, ". . . then you shall arise and go up to the place that Yahweh your God will choose. . . ."). Hence, the cases would in effect be presented before God.¹²⁰ Reference to the judge's special jurisdiction over difficult cases provides a connection with the etiological passage in Ex. 18:13-27.¹²¹ The charismatic and parenetic role of the judge is also mentioned here. Moses and those who succeed him are charged not only with settling disputes but with exhorting the people to covenant faithfulness.

The conclusion suggests itself that the historical Samuel was none other than a 'minor' judge, according to the pattern described in these passages.¹²² The title of "judge" encompasses Samuel's activities as lawgiver and his prominent place in the cult. Furthermore, the close parallels with Moses are explainable, either as they actually existed or were later attached to the figure of Samuel, since his function in Israel was a Mosaic one. The actual references to Samuel as a judge (7:6, 15-16; 8:1-3) appear therefore to be historical reminiscences of his function in Israel.

The account in 8:1-3 is especially important since

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 417.

¹²¹ See above, p. 271. Cf. Noth, Exodus, p. 150.

¹²² von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, 33. Weiser, Samuel, p. 10. Wildberger, op. cit., p. 464. Ironically Noth himself refuses to apply the title to Samuel. History, p. 170.

it reflects the institutional character of the office:

"When Samuel became old, he placed his sons as judges over Israel. . . ." At the same time succession was not automatic. Samuel's sons failed to wear the mantle of their father (vv. 2-3). They were unfit to succeed to the office, and the elders sought someone else (v. 5). The implication of this brief passage is that succession was provided for in the office of judge, but each man had to demonstrate his worthiness as a defender of the sacred traditions. Kraus' reference to the "charismatic office" of the law-giver is very useful in this connection.¹²³ It need not be a contradiction in terms.

In an article on the various roles in which Samuel appears, John L. MacKenzie contends that the historical Samuel was a leader of the "sons of the prophets."¹²⁴ These men exercised an influential role in Israel. They combined a conservative love for the sacred traditions with a radical zeal. As zealots in the defense of exclusive loyalty to Yahweh, they would surely have opposed the monarchy.¹²⁵ This view of Samuel is contained in the "seer"

¹²³Kraus, Die prophetische Verkündigung, p. 23. Kraus discusses the problem of the relation of office and charisma in connection with Deut. 18:15-18. Kraus contends that continuity in the prophetic "office" is provided in God's promise to "raise up . . . a prophet" Himself. More than this is implied in the case of Samuel's sons, however, since apparently it was anticipated that they would automatically inherit their father's position.

¹²⁴John L. MacKenzie, "The Four Samuels," BR VII (1962), 3-18.

¹²⁵Ibid., pp. 16-17.

traditions (9:1-10:16; 16:1-23; 19:18-24), although MacKenzie contends that the historical Samuel should not be called a seer. In these passages Samuel's functions are predominantly cultic. He blesses sacrifice (9:13), anoints the nagid at Yahweh's request (10:1), and presides over the sacrifice at Bethlehem (16:5). In 19:19 he is referred to as the head of the prophets. Samuel's opposition to the monarchy, which MacKenzie considers historical, is not prominent in these traditions.¹²⁶ Instead the judge-traditions (1:1-28; 7:3-8:22; 10:17-25; 12:1-25) most accurately portray the elements of the conflict between Samuel, who steadfastly defended the amphictyonic ideal, and the people, who demanded a king. The tension within Samuel is emphasized in these passages. On the one hand, he is tormented by the popular demand for a king. At the same time, he is aware that the monarchy will undermine Israel's faith. In the final analysis Samuel had to accept what was inevitable and seek to control the king.¹²⁷

MacKenzie rejects the view of Samuel as a judge on two grounds. He argues that the office as Noth defines it is primarily political. This does not agree with the undoubtedly religious position which Samuel holds in the majority of the Samuel-Saul narratives. Secondly, MacKenzie views the narratives of Samuel as judge to be highly

¹²⁶ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

¹²⁷ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

artificial in character, i.e., predominantly theological. He identifies them as Deuteronomic.¹²⁸

These objections are not conclusive, however. A clear distinction between "political" and "religious" is far from evident. Even if the distinction is accepted, the office of "minor judge" is surely not exclusively political. In Ex. 18:13-27, the cultic or religious functions of the judge are prominent.¹²⁹ Furthermore Samuel's involvement in the choice of a king indicates his responsibility in the "political" sphere. This view of his role appears in the "seer" traditions as well as in the judge narratives. One merit of the theory that Samuel was a judge is precisely that it encompasses both the "religious" and "political" deeds of Samuel. MacKenzie's additional observation that Samuel appears as a judge only in artificially constructed passages is questionable in light of the evidence for their early date.¹³⁰

In order to understand Samuel's historical role more fully, it is necessary to consider the implications of the establishment of monarchy in Israel. An understanding of the practices and prerogatives of Saul as Israel's first monarch will also indicate the Sitz im Leben

¹²⁸Ibid., p. 15.

¹²⁹See above, pp. 270-71.

¹³⁰See above, pp. 216-22.

for those traditions which comprise the anti-monarchical source.

Events in Palestine in the eleventh century B. C. presented the tribes of Israel with a serious threat to their existence. One group of the "Sea Peoples" enjoyed a unity or "national" cohesiveness that was unique in Canaan. From their individual city states in the plains of Palestine, they were able to attack the disparate settlements of Israelite tribes in the mountainous hinterland.¹³¹ Israel's successful defense against these disciplined warriors in Saul's battles at Gibeah (I Sam. 13) and at Ziklag (27:5ff) were exceptional. The battle of Aphek (4:1-22) is illustrative of the consternation that convulsed the amphictyony. The major cult sanctuary at Shiloh may also have been destroyed by the Philistines, although the archaeological evidence is uncertain.¹³² The extent of oppression under which Israel suffered is best demonstrated by the reaction it caused. After over a century of delay, the tribes accepted the system of monarchy. An organized state eventually emerged under David and

¹³¹Alt, "The Formation of the Israelite State," Essays, pp. 173-76.

¹³²The evidence for the destruction of Shiloh in the eleventh century B. C. centers on the discovery of the remains of House A. The house was clearly destroyed in the eleventh century, but further excavation of the site is necessary to determine if all of Shiloh was also destroyed. Hans Kjaer, The Excavation of Shilo (Copenhagen, 1930), pp. 18-23.

Solomon.¹³³

Samuel and Saul were destined to play major roles in the events that transformed Israel from a loosely organized theocracy into a state more typical of the Ancient Near East, in which the needs of the state were served by a king as well as a priest and judge. Saul was the first king of Israel. This is clear from numerous passages, regardless of source (10:1; 11:15; 12:13). To be sure, the exact nature of his "kingship" is subject to debate. In his essay on the establishment of the Israelite state, Alt identifies Saul with the major judges more than with the kings who succeed him. The decisive factor in this continuity with the past is the charisma. At one point, Alt states his thesis succinctly by claiming that the monarchy

was entirely native in its origin, arising from the fact that the earliest constitution of the Israelite state was simply a new form of the Israelite system of military conscription adapted to the needs of the situation and based on the long-developed concept of charismatic leadership.¹³⁴

Thus the first king was the last judge. The new element that gave an institutional and permanent aspect to the rule of the charismatic hero was the acclamation of the people. This dual movement of Yahweh's designation and the people's acclaim is represented in the distinction between nagid and

¹³³Alt, "Formation of the Israelite State," Essays, p. 182. Cf. also Noth, "God, King, and Nation in the Old Testament," Laws, pp. 161-62.

¹³⁴Alt, "Formation of the Israelite State," Essays, pp. 196-97.

melek and is definitive of kingship in Israel.¹³⁵

With regard to Saul, Alt sets aside the accounts in the anti-monarchical source and in 9:1-10:16 as unhistorical and indicates that 11:1-15 provides the historical record of the birth of Israelite kingship. Thus, in the face of the Ammonite attack Saul comes to Israel's rescue after the "spirit of God" has come upon him (v. 6). With a remarkable number of troops (v. 8), Saul defeats the enemy (v. 11). It only remains for the people to acclaim him as king (vv. 12-15). If one accepts 11:1-15 as the most reliable account of the birth of kingship in Israel, it appears that Saul was indeed a judge. It should be noted, however, that Saul and his men rather than Yahweh achieve the victory. This departs markedly from the ideology in the narrative of the major judges, as Alt himself admits.¹³⁶

In his article on "Samuel and the Rise of the Monarchy," W. A. Irwin argues in a similar way that 11:1-15 is the most likely historical account of the birth of kingship, due to its direct and simple narration of the events. Saul's position as leader is the direct result of his courage and ability in a crisis. Irwin cites the independent testimony of 31:11-13, where Saul is remembered by the Jabesh-

¹³⁵Ibid., pp. 194-95.

¹³⁶Ibid., p. 189, f.n. 39.

Gileadites.¹³⁷ He does not consider the improbability that no mention is made in 31:11-13 of the birth of kingship, as would be expected if such a momentous event involved the Jabesh-Gileadites. While Alt views the chapter as a unit, Irwin takes the theory of Saul's kingship as a continuation of the rule of the judges to its logical conclusion: Samuel had no part in the events.¹³⁸ The reference to Samuel in v. 8 appears to be an insertion, since the events center entirely on Saul. Furthermore, the entire event is narrated in vv. 1-11, so that the closing verses of the chapter, which involve Samuel in renewal of the kingship, are probably an addition or perhaps the direct continuation of 10:27.

As part of their theory of the rise of the monarchy, both scholars deny the validity of those accounts which emphasize Samuel's position of leadership in Israel or speak of his opposition to the monarchy (e.g., 7:3-17; 8:1-22; 10:17-26).¹³⁹ Indeed no reason would exist for opposing Saul if his leadership over Israel were strictly military and a result of his charisma at a time of national emergency.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁷Irwin, op. cit., p. 113.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 129.

¹³⁹Alt, "Formation of the Israelite State," Essays, pp. 185-86. Irwin, op. cit., pp. 121-25.

¹⁴⁰Alt claims that defense against Philistine attack was "almost the only significant purpose of the founding of the Israelite state, and almost the only of the monarchy." Ibid., p. 196.

Several problems are raised by this approach to the nature of Saul's kingship and Samuel's role in its establishment, however. The relation of 11:1-15 to the kingship is questionable. Alt stresses that the monarchy arose in Israel because of the threat of the Philistines, and yet in this account the danger is posed by the Ammonites. In his discussion of an early, monarchical source, Adolphe Lods acknowledges the force of this objection by suggesting that the account of the accession occurs in 13:1-14:52 where the enemy is the Philistines. Furthermore, Saul is in his home territory for the Philistine battles and not engaged in a distant encounter across the Jordan, as in the battle of Jabesh-Gilead.¹⁴¹

Several aspects of the account of the battle at Jabesh-Gilead are improbable and render questionable the historical reliability of the pericope. The number of troops is greatly exaggerated. The proposal of the Jabeshites for a respite of precisely seven days is unlikely, and even more improbable is the willingness of the Ammonites to accept such a proposal.¹⁴² Saul appears as an unknown farmer. He commands none of the attention that would be expected of one previously designated a nagid (10:1). For these reasons I am inclined to see the account in 11:1-11 as a narrative from Saul's early life, prior to the

¹⁴¹Lods, Israel, pp. 352-53.

¹⁴²Wildberger, op. cit., p. 448.

monarchy.

A second criticism of Alt's thesis concerns the nature of Saul's charisma. It differs from that of a major judge and is more analogous to the "spirit of God" which a king would possess. In 9:1-10:16 Saul is selected by Yahweh to be a nagid (9:16) and is anointed by Samuel (10:1). Accordingly, the "spirit of God" seizes him (10:6, 10). The charisma is thus closely related to Saul's anointment. When the spirit seizes him, the result is not victory in battle as with the judges. Instead Saul begins to prophesy (10:10).¹⁴³ When Saul engages in battle with the Philistines (13:1-14:46), charisma does not enter in. Indeed, Saul must consult an oracle for divination (14:41-42). His charisma or divinely granted power to rule is apparently transferable as that of the judges was not. Otherwise the list of Saul's descendants in 14:49-50 would be of no significance. Further evidence that Saul's charisma was not limited to himself but extended to his "dynasty" appears in the addition 13:13-14 (probably Deuteronomic) where Samuel refers to Yahweh's intent to establish his house forever.¹⁴⁴

Other elements in the traditions of Saul's rule over Israel indicate that his role in Israel's life marked a notable departure from the manner of the judges. His

¹⁴³Walter Beyerlin, "Das Königscharisma bei Saul," ZAW LXXIII (1961), 187.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 196-97.

functions extended beyond that of military leader. In 8:20 the people anticipate someone who will judge them, and 10:1 speaks of Saul as one who will govern Israel. For this verse, LXX should be followed. A lengthy passage after hlw' has fallen out of MT. It is attested in LXX and may be reconstructed as follows: mshk yhwh lngyd 'l-'mw
'l-ysr'l w'th t'sr b'm yhwh w'th twšy'nw myd 'wybyw wzh-lk
h'wt,

(Did not) Yahweh anoint you as a prince over his people, over Israel? You shall govern the people of Yahweh, and you shall save them from the hand of their enemies. This will be a sign to you (that Yahweh anointed you). . . .¹⁴⁵

The scribe's eye skipped from the initial mshk to the second one. While the verb 'sr (lit., "to restrain") is only a conjecture based on its use in 9:17, LXX does read "you shall rule."

Among his peace-time functions Saul rules on the eating of sacrificial meat (14:32-34; cf. Lev. 19:26, the prohibition against eating blood). His expulsion of sorcerers from the land (28:3, 9) is an application of Pentateuchal law (Lev. 19:26b).¹⁴⁶ His priestly functions as king are evident in the building of an altar for the people's sacrifices (14:35). Presumably Saul will offer these sacrifices. In the incident at Gilgal, narrated in 13:7b-15, Samuel's rebuke apparently refers to the command

¹⁴⁵Driver, Notes, p. 78.

¹⁴⁶Beyerlin, "Königscharisma," p. 198.

that Saul wait seven days. The severity of Samuel's action connotes much more, however. One cannot avoid the conclusion that Samuel is desperately maintaining his prerogatives as priest in the new order of the monarchy, in which the king enjoyed certain rights in this sphere (cf. David who built an altar at Jerusalem, II Sam. 24:25; Solomon who sacrificed at Gibeon, I Kgs. 3:15; Jeroboam who founded the sanctuary in Bethel and arranged the calendar of feasts, I Kgs. 12:26-33).

Saul's functions as priest probably indicate Canaanite influences upon Israel's life and institutions. At Ugarit, Keret discharges priestly duties himself (Keret I. 4:5-11). He sacrifices "... a lamb for sacrifice, in his hand a kid from the enclosure." The king was the mediator of divine revelation and the embodiment of the people before their God (cf. Keret I. 1:35-2:8, where El speaks to Keret in a dream about his progeny).¹⁴⁷ Saul was not the recipient of divine revelation. Instead he had to consult Samuel or an oracle to receive God's will. By the time of Solomon, Yahweh spoke directly with the king, as in the ritual incubation at Gibeon (I Kgs. 3:5ff).

Unlike the Judges, Saul is able to delegate his functions to others. Thus, Abijah takes over the priestly task of consulting the oracle (14:18), and Abner becomes field

¹⁴⁷ John Gray, The Legacy of Canaan (Leiden, 1957), pp. 152-53. Canaanite Myths and Legends (Edinburgh, 1956), pp. 29-33.

general (14:50; 17:55ff). This is similar to Canaanite practice as reflected in the case of Jabin, whose field commander was Sisera (Jud. 4:2ff).¹⁴⁸

Finally Saul's anointment links him with the kings of Israel. In 10:1, he is anointed nagid by Samuel, who pours a vial of oil on his head. This parallels the practice with other Israelite kings, such as David (16:13), Solomon (IKgs. 1:39), Jehu (I Kgs. 19:15-16), and Joash (II Kgs. 11:12).¹⁴⁹ The anointment of kings in Israel was probably a practice inherited from her neighbors. Although it was not practiced in Mesopotamia or Egypt, Hittite kings were anointed with "the holy oil of kingship."¹⁵⁰ The practice is attested among Israel's neighbors, the Canaanites. It is incidentally referred to in Jotham's fable (Jud. 9:8, 15). In one of the Amarna letters, a Canaanite prince Addu-nirari writes the Pharaoh, "See, when Manah-biria king of Egypt, thy grandfather, made Taku, my grandfather, king in Nuhashshe, and put oil upon his head."¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁸Beyerlin, "Königscharisma," pp. 200-01. Cf. also C. R. North, "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," ZAW L (1932), 9.

¹⁴⁹The elevation of Joash to kingship is especially instructive for its parallels with Saul's case. Both are anointed and then acclaimed by the people, why hmlk ("Long live the king!"); cf. 10:24.

¹⁵⁰Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel, tr. John McHugh (New York, 1961; tr. of Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament, Paris, 1958-60), p. 104.

¹⁵¹North, op. cit., p. 14. Cf. J. A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna Tafeln (Leipzig, 1915), I, 319.

Thus, it may be concluded that Saul's role in Israel's life marked a distinctly new pattern. He was appropriately acclaimed a king. The manner of his succession, as well as some of his deeds, indicate that the people's desire to be "like all the nations" (8:20) was fulfilled, at least in part. I do not mean to suggest that Saul functioned as a king in the manner of David who succeeds him. There is no indication that Saul extended the frontiers of the land, or established such marks of nationhood as foreign trade and a centralized administrative and worship center. The tribal structure remained unchanged, and Saul had no permanent court (cf. 20:25; 22:6).

His failure may have derived from an inability to solve the dilemma of obedience to the religious obligations of the amphictyony, on the one hand, and dependence on popular support, on the other. The dilemma is most clearly apparent in 15:4-8, 12-14, 20-23, 29-30a, 31a, 32-34. Saul has permitted the people to ignore the ban and thus incurred the wrath of Samuel, whose authority over him is apparent. Samuel sees Saul's unwillingness to oppose the people as a threat to the unconditional demands of the Israelite faith. This perception of the internal tension in Saul's reign reveals the intimate association of the authors with the actual events narrated.

David succeeded in surmounting the problem. His professional army provided him with a power base independent of the people. Furthermore, he brought Israel's religious life under his own political aegis by establishing the sanctuary in his capital city of Jerusalem. The Davidic covenant articulated in II Sam. 7 is indicative of the success that David enjoyed in overcoming the difficulties which thwarted Saul's kingship.¹⁵²

In spite of the somewhat limited extent of Saul's rule as king, the circumstances of his succession and the practices in which he engaged constituted the establishment of a religious and political leadership that appeared as a rejection of basic amphictyonic theology. Henceforth, the king and not Yahweh would be the leader in war. In this regard it may be significant that Yahweh plays so little a part in the battle with the Ammonites or with the Philistines (cf., however, 14:23). No longer was the central figure in Israel's cult the priest or the prophet who faithfully represented the covenantal obligations that bound the people to their God. Rather than an example of obedience, the new king presents an example of cult sacrifice as the heart of the religious life (15:22-23). The conclusion is warranted that the anti-monarchical source accurately represented the central issue in the people's

¹⁵²Weiser, "I Samuel 15," pp. 25-27.

demand for a king: ". . . you have this day rejected your God, who saves you from all your calamities and your distresses; and you have said, 'No! but set a king over us'" (10:19a).

5. Origin of the Anti-Monarchical Source

It is not too much to conjecture that the traditions set forth in the anti-monarchical source originated among a circle of Israelites who saw the theological issues posed by the advent of monarchy that replaced the amphictyonic and theocratic organization of Israelite tribes. Their interests were northern and prophetic. They were intimately familiar with the traditions preserved in cult sanctuaries such as Mizpah and Gilgal, and they were zealous in their devotion to the purity of Yahweh faith. This group was nearly contemporaneous with the events they portray and indeed may have been followers of Samuel. Certainly Samuel was their ideal. The early date suggested for the origin of the anti-monarchical source provides additional evidence for the conclusion that the crisis over the establishment of a monarchy resulted in an account of these events which stressed the theological issues involved and called for a preservation of the theocratic organization of the amphictyony with Samuel as its (Mosaic) leader. Scholars have consistently argued that such a crisis existed during the early

monarchy, although the view of Saul as the last of the judges has weakened this line of argument. Nevertheless, the accounts which present this view and emphasize Samuel's role in Israel have been judged non-historical and a product of theological thought several centuries later.¹⁵³ It seems to me a simpler and more satisfactory theory to suggest that this opposition which was expressive of central tenets of Israel's faith prompted an account of the adoption of monarchy soon after the events themselves.

In a related theory Bourke suggests that the Battle of Aphek was the terminus a quo, at least for the account of Samuel's birth and call. After this battle the ark was located in Judah, and Ephraim was decimated by the war. The north had lost the ark and thus a key element in her primacy before Yahweh. Nevertheless, she did not view herself as rejected by her God (cf. Ps. 78:67ff). After all Yahweh had given Israel a great prophet, "like unto Moses." Samuel was the mark of her direct continuity with the sacred traditions of the past, just as the ark became Judah's claim

¹⁵³Noth, for example, comments on the claim in chap. 8 that the monarchy was a rejection of Yahweh: "... it is likely that in this an attitude to monarchy as such was being expressed which was certainly later confirmed time and again by the experiences which the people had of the institution, but which had, however, existed from the very beginning and had made itself felt even before the rise of the monarchy." Noth, History, pp. 172-73. Cf. also Bright, op. cit., p. 167. Kittel, op. cit., pp. 112-113.

to legitimacy.¹⁵⁴ It may be questioned whether the battle of Aphek and the events immediately following it were so decisive for the fate of north and south, however. Probably the ark remained under Philistine control, since the account of its fate in 4:1-7:2 closes with the melancholy note that "all the house of Israel lamented after Yahweh."¹⁵⁵ Furthermore, nothing is heard of the ark from the time of these events until II Sam. 6 and the reign of David. Probably the ark did not return to the Israelites until some time during David's successful battles against the Philistines. I have suggested that the account of Samuel's birth and call was not added to the anti-monarchical source until the time of Ahijah, when once again the prophetic ideal as well as the memory of Shiloh as a cult sanctuary find expression.

In the foregoing chapter I contended that themes held in common by E and D as well as terminology prominent in both sources appear also in the anti-monarchical source. The conclusion is warranted that the prophetic circle responsible for the anti-monarchical source also shaped and influenced the traditions that later appear in the Elohist and Deuteronomy. While a date for the anti-monarchical source in the century after the time of Samuel is likely,

¹⁵⁴Bourke, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-80.

¹⁵⁵Cf. Chapter III, p. 94.

the Elohist source and Deuteronomy are of a later time.

In the case of the Elohist, it seems reasonable to find its Sitz im Leben as a source, approaching the form in which it now exists, in a decisive period of the history of the northern kingdom.¹⁵⁶ As I note below,¹⁵⁷ Jenks argues for the reign of Jeroboam I as a suitable date. While this is possible since considerable national spirit was doubtless occasioned by the split with the south, it is more likely that the interests of E in prophecy suggest the time of Elijah and Elisha when prophetic opposition to the corruption in court and cult was prominent.¹⁵⁸ A prominent theme in the Elohist source is the sinfulness of Israel, even in her earliest life as a "nation" (cf. Ex. 32:34, "But now go, lead the people to the place of which I have spoken to you; behold, my angel shall go before you. Nevertheless, in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them."). The judgment without mercy that Elijah levels against Israel in I Kgs. 19:14-18 is reminiscent of this view. The inclusion of the incident of the molten calf in E (Ex. 32) may be explained by the memory of Jeroboam's

¹⁵⁶Norman Gottwald has suggested correctly that without the disruption of the united kingdom, the Elohist source with its distinctively northern features and above all its attitude toward the monarchy is not conceivable. A Light to the Nations (New York, 1959), p. 252.

¹⁵⁷See pp. 308-09.

¹⁵⁸Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 203.

cult of the bull at Dan and Bethel.

The Book of Deuteronomy has been confidently dated in the time immediately preceding the reform of Josiah in 621 B. C. by most scholars since Wellhausen. A notable exception to this consensus was the theory of A. C. Welch, who contended that the passages dealing with worship at a central sanctuary (i.e., Jerusalem) constitute only a small portion of the book. In Welch's view, the emphasis upon a pure faith of obedience to Yahweh in the face of Canaanite syncretism indicates that Deuteronomy in its original form comes from the period of the judges. In this period "Israel" had no outward unity or identity. Hence, the emphasis upon the distinctiveness of her life was necessary, lest she be absorbed by the surrounding peoples.¹⁵⁹ Canaanite sanctuaries, still prevalent in the land, were to be avoided at all costs. Thus the law concerning burnt offerings includes the typical stipulation, "Take care that you do not offer your burnt offerings at every place you see. . . ." (Deut. 12:13).¹⁶⁰ The value of Welch's theory is not his argument against any connection of Deuteronomy with Josiah's reform, for here he exceeds the evidence. Instead Welch represents the tendency of scholars to recognize the northern provenance of the material in Deuteronomy

¹⁵⁹ Welch, op. cit., pp. 203-08.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 46. Cf. also T. Oestreicher, Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz (Gütersloh, 1923).

and to suggest that at least portions of the book doubtless had a history prior to the second half of the seventh century B. C.¹⁶¹

Albrecht Alt has argued persuasively that the book discovered by Josiah in the temple originated in the Assyrian province of Samaria after the fall of the northern kingdom.¹⁶² The northern provenance of the book is indicated by the attitude toward the monarchy in Deut. 17:15b-20, where the author cannot deny its reality but neither can he allow the powers of kingship to remain unchecked. A similar attitude is present in Hosea, who views kingship as a threat to the covenant between Yahweh and His people (Hos. 7:3; 8:4, 10; 10:3).¹⁶³ The basic theme of Deuteronomy is the exclusive relationship between Yahweh and Israel. The obligation of Israel to love Yahweh (6:4) is the ethical basis for the book. A similar theme is prominent in Hosea and probably has its antecedents in the Elohist and the narratives of Elijah and Elisha.¹⁶⁴ What circumstance gave rise to this document with its ideal of a pure Yahwistic

¹⁶¹Thus, Johannes Hempel, Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums (Leipzig, 1914). Gustav Hölscher, "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," ZAW 40 (1923), 161-255. Friedrich Horst, Gottes Recht (Berlin, 1961).

¹⁶²Alt, "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums," Kleine Schriften, II, 274-75. Cf. also Bright, History, pp. 299-300.

¹⁶³Ibid., pp. 264-67.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 270-73.

faith? Alt observes that Assyria would not have deported all Israelites after the fall of the kingdom. Instead most of the peasantry probably remained on the land as a base for an Assyrian province. Among these conservative folk the dream of freedom from the Assyrian masters would not die. Rather than looking to the kingdom of David for deliverance, their hope crystalized in a plan for the revival of the Heerbann and theocracy of old.¹⁶⁵

Among the themes common to E and D is the emphasis upon Moses. It can now be concluded that the same emphasis occurs in the anti-monarchical source in the sense that Samuel is portrayed in ways similar to Moses. The intriguing question raises itself of the direction of this influence. The early date of the anti-monarchical source suggests the theory that the figure of Samuel determined the view of Moses in E and D, and not vice versa, especially since the nearly contemporary figure of Samuel would perhaps dominate the prophetic circle from which the traditions of Moses and Samuel derive.

One writer reaches this conclusion. Jenks dates the anti-monarchical traditions in the early monarchical period and the Elohist source in the reign of Jeroboam I (922-901).¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 273-75. Alt maintains that the original or a copy ("Abschrift") of the book was brought to Jerusalem and placed in the temple under circumstances now unknown.

¹⁶⁶Jenks, op. cit., pp. 253-60. Jenks argues that just as the establishment of a strong political and religious center in the south under David and Solomon had given rise to

He finds the portrayal of Samuel in the anti-monarchical traditions and of Moses in E virtually identical. Jenks reviews the similarities in the call narratives of the two figures and emphasizes the role of both Moses and Samuel as intercessors on behalf of the people before Yahweh. He concludes that

it would be difficult to escape recognizing that this E portrait of Moses is almost identical with the portrait of Samuel drawn by the prophetic traditions of I Samuel. In every respect Samuel fulfills the prophetic office of Moses, even to being covenant mediator, holy-war leader, and judge.¹⁶⁷

Jenks does not equate the circles responsible for the "prophetic traditions of I Samuel" and those responsible for the Elohist source. He contends that the two circles were closely related, however. Jenks suggests as a reason for the striking similarity between E's portrait of Moses and the view of Samuel in the anti-monarchical source that "perhaps the historical figure of Samuel, as remembered by his prophetic followers, actually served as a Vorbild for the figure of Moses among a closely related E-circle."¹⁶⁸

While it is possible, the theory seems unlikely to me. It assumes that over the course of two centuries no traditions

the Yahwist source, so by analogy the establishment of a political state with cult centers at Dan and Bethel was accompanied by the formulation of the E source, a distinctively northern account of Israel's origin.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 224.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 225.

of the role of Moses in the exodus and wilderness wandering were preserved (in oral tradition), even by those tribes that sojourned in Egypt.¹⁶⁹

Probably the question of the relation of the earliest traditions of Moses and those of Samuel is answered by a theory of mutual influence. Doubtless certain traditions of Moses' role in Israel existed in the age of Samuel and influenced the view of Israel's judge as well as the understanding of his office. At the same time the fundamental challenge to the life of Israel occasioned by the establishment of the monarchy and Samuel's response to this event as

¹⁶⁹In his analysis of the history of Pentateuchal traditions, M. Noth discusses the place of Moses in the various traditions: exodus from Egypt, revelation at Sinai, wilderness wandering, and entrance into Canaan. He concludes that the figure of Moses in these traditions is not historical. The only historical tradition concerning Moses is the account of his death and burial in Transjordan (Deut. 34:6-8). This account is one element of the narrative of the wilderness wandering--a narrative that cannot be viewed as an independent whole but as a collection of "local sagas." The oldest account that elaborates the role of Moses is found in the laws of Deuteronomy, where Moses is the first in a series of mediators and interpreters of the covenantal law. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte, pp. 172-92. Cf. especially pp. 175-6 and 186. While Noth's theory accords well with the suggestion that the portrayal of Moses is dependent on the figure of Samuel, it is not convincing and leaves unanswered the question of the early emergence of tribal unity. How is the phenomenon of action in concert that is reflected in the Song of Deborah, for example, to be explained apart from earlier unity around a strong leader? Noth's theory depends in large part upon the view that the Pentateuchal traditions were originally independent of one another. Thus, he can view the role of Moses in each one separately. However, this theory of the separate existence of the traditions is far from established, and the fact that Moses appears as the unequalled leader of "Israel" in all of them indicates an original historical reality behind the admittedly greatly expanded traditions.

one who preserved the integrity of Yahwist faith probably served to define more concretely the role of covenant mediator in Israel. In turn this influenced the traditions about Moses that derive from the same prophetic circle.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion I should like to return to the figure of Samuel. In the discussion of Samuel as a new Moses and in the attempt to define his role in Israel's political and religious life, I have sought to broaden our understanding of Samuel's significant position in pre-monarchical Israel. As probably Joshua before him, Samuel was intimately connected with the cult sanctuary at Shiloh. His official role among the tribes was that of a judge, responsible primarily to interpret and proclaim the covenant law and the traditions upon which it was based. Furthermore, he exercised the Mosaic function of intercession on behalf of the people before Yahweh. The crisis over establishment of the monarchy gave him special importance, however. In his role as the primary defender of the amphictyony and of the unique Israelite principle that all aspects of society were subject to God's law, Samuel at first opposed the kingship and then brought it under the sovereignty of God's will as expressed in His law. Samuel

is very clear that the king, as anyone else in Israel, is subject to the law. In 12:4, he warns, "If you will fear Yahweh and serve him and hearken to his voice . . . and if both you and the king who reigns over you will follow Yahweh your God, . . ." (cf. Deut. 17:20, where the king is to read the law continually so that he will not consider himself better than his fellow Israelites).

In all probability a personal element entered into the opposition of Samuel to the idea of a monarchy. No doubt he knew of the exalted position that kings enjoyed in other countries. It was not difficult to imagine that in Israel a king would claim jurisdiction over numerous aspects of Israel's life, not only the military but also the religious and judicial spheres. As I have indicated, this began even with Saul whose authority was hardly well defined. These developments could only mean that Samuel's own position in Israel would be limited and his authority questioned.

In a sense the issue was one of conflict between civil and religious authority, although the distinction between these spheres was not precise in Israel.¹⁷⁰ Samuel presumably functioned in the civil sphere as Moses had done, and the king quickly became a prominent figure in Israel's

¹⁷⁰Robertson, "Samuel and Saul," pp. 201-04. Robertson's argument that the personal conflict between Samuel and Saul dominates the entire narrative is overdrawn, however.

religious life. Nevertheless Samuel was the central figure in the cult and the chief advocate of the religious concerns of his people. The monarchy challenged this theocratic arrangement. The severity with which Samuel rebukes Saul, especially in 13:7b-15 where Saul's position is just, indicates how seriously Samuel was threatened. Perhaps this is also the reason for Samuel's impassioned defense of himself in his covenant renewal speech (12:1-5).

Samuel was successful in his efforts to preserve the integrity of Israel's life under Yahweh and his own position of authority over the king. Nevertheless, his cause was a losing one. As the position of the king became stabilized under David, the "prophet like unto Moses" is limited to those practices which are religious in the strict sense of the word. It is warranted to conclude that the age of Samuel marks a basic compromise in the important cultic office which Samuel held. Scharbert aptly summarizes this development: "Mit der Errichtung des Königtums beginnt die Aufsplitterung des Mittleramtes auf mehrere zeitweise miteinander konkurrierende Ämter."¹⁷¹

In spite of these changes in Israel's corporate life, Samuel persevered in his role as representative and defender of Israel's covenant with Yahweh. The task was much more than that of resistance to the emergence of new

¹⁷¹Scharbert, op. cit., p. 119.

societal patterns. In this he would surely have failed. Samuel's proclamation of covenantal obligations to the people and their newly appointed king (12:14-15) and his pledge never to cease in his role as intercessor and teacher (12:22) indicate the positive nature of his task. Samuel applied the heritage of the past to the needs of the present.¹⁷² His insight permitted him to understand the needs of a new era without forsaking the normative events of Israel's history. In this way he kept alive the unique traditions of Israel's covenant relation with Yahweh.

¹⁷²Weiser, Samuel, pp. 93-94.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, W. F. Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1961.
- _____. "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII," Vetus Testamentum, 9 (1959), 338-46.
- Alt, Albrecht. "The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion. Tr. R. A. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966. Pages 173-237.
- _____. "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums," Kleine Schriften. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953. II, 250-75.
- _____. "Josua," Kleine Schriften. München: C. H. Beck, 1964. I, 176-92.
- _____. "The Origins of Israelite Law," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion. Tr. R. A. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966. Pages 79-132.
- Baltzer, Klaus. Das Bundesformular. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960.
- Bentzen, Aage. "The Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (1948), 37-53.
- Bewer, Julius A. The Literature of the Old Testament. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.
- Beyerlin, Walter. "Gattung und Herkunft des Rahmens im Richterbuch," Tradition und Situation. Eds. Ernst Wurthwein and Otto Kaiser. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- _____. "Das Königscharisma bei Saul," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXVII (1948), 186-201.
- _____. Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions. Tr. S. Rudman. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Biblia Hebraica. Ed. Rudolf Kittel. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.

Boer, P. A. H. de. Research into the Text of I Samuel I-XVI. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1938.

Bostrom, Otto H. Alternative Readings in the Hebrew of the Books of Samuel. Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Book Concern, 1918.

Bourke, Joseph. "Samuel and the Ark, A Study in Contrasts," Dominican Studies, VII (1954), 73-103.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.

Brinker, R. The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1946.

Brooke, A. E. and McLean, N. (eds.). The Old Testament in Greek. London: Cambridge University Press, 1927.

Buber, Martin. "Die Erzählung von Sauls Königswahl," Vetus Testamentum, VI (1956), 113-173.

Budde, Karl. Books of Samuel. Tr. B. W. Bacon. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1894.

_____. Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau. Giessen: J. Ricker, 1890.

_____. Samuel (Kurzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament, VIII). Ed. Karl Marti. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1902.

_____. "Sauls Königswahl und Verwerfung," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, VIII (1888), 227-48.

Caird, George. "Introduction and Exegesis of I-II Samuel," The Interpreter's Bible. Ed. George Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953. II, 855-1176.

Carpenter, J. E. and Harford-Battersby, G. The Hexateuch. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1900.

Childs, Brevard. "The Birth of Moses," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV (1965), 110-22.

Cornill, Carl H. "Ein elohistischer Bericht über die Entstehung des israelitischen Königtums in I Samuelis i-xv aufgezeigt," Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft und Kirchliches Leben, VI (1885), 113-41.

_____. "Noch einmal Sauls Königswahl und Verwerfung," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, X (1890), 96-109.

Cross, Frank M., Jr. "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XII (1953), 274-77.

_____. "The History of the Biblical Text," The Harvard Theological Review, LVII (1964), 281-99.

_____. "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 132 (December, 1953), pp. 15-26.

_____. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 147-72.

_____. "A Report on the Biblical Fragments of Cave Four in Wadi Qumran," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 141 (February, 1956), pp. 9-13.

Cross, Frank M., Jr. and Freedman, D. N. "The Blessing of Moses," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (1948), 191-210.

Dahood, Mitchell. Psalms I (The Anchor Bible). Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1966.

Driver, S. R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy (International Critical Commentary). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.

_____. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

_____. A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.

Dus, J. "Die Analyse zweier Ladeerzählungen des Josuabuches," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXII (1960), 107-34.

Ehrlich, Arnold. Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910. Vol. III.

- Eissfeldt, Otto. Die Komposition der Samuelisbücher.
Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1931.
- _____. Das Lied Moses Deuteronomium 32:1-43 und das
Lehrgedicht Asaphs, Psalm 78, samt einer Analyse der
Umgebung des Mose-Liedes. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag,
1958.
- _____. The Old Testament. An Introduction. Tr. Peter R.
Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Fohrer, Georg and Sellin, Ernst. Einleitung in das alte
Testament. Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer, 1965.
- Gottwald, Norman K. "'Holy War' in Deuteronomy: Analysis
and Critique," Review and Expositor, LXI, 4 (Fall,
1964), 296-310.
- _____. A Light to the Nations. An Introduction to the
Old Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
- Graf, Karl Heinrich. Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten
Testaments. Leipzig: I. O. Weigel, 1866.
- Gray, John. Canaanite Myths and Legends (Old Testament
Studies, No. 3). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956.
- Gressmann, H. Die Anfänge Israels (Die Schriften des Alten
Testaments in Auswahl, I). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &
Ruprecht, 1921-22.
- Grether, Oskar. Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament.
Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1934.
- Gunkel, Hermann and Begrich, Joachim. Einleitung in die
Psalmen (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament). Göttingen:
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933.
- Habel, N. "The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives,"
Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,
LXXVII (1965), 297-323.
- Harrelson, Walter. "Worship in Early Israel," Biblical
Research, III (1958), 1-14.
- Hatch, Edwin and Redpath, Henry A. A Concordance to the
Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testa-
ment. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.
- Hempel, Johannes. Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums. Leip-
zig: R. Voigtländer, 1914.

- Hertzberg, Hans William. I & II Samuel. A Commentary. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.
- _____. "Mizpa," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVII (1929), 161-96.
- Hillers, Delbert. Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964.
- Hölscher, Gustav. Geschichtsschreibung in Israel. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1952.
- _____. "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, XL (1923), 161-255.
- Holtz, Kurt. I Samuel 1-7. Text- und Quellenkritisch Untersucht. Leipzig: W. Drugulin, 1904.
- Horst, Friedrich. Gottes Recht. Berlin: C. Kaiser, 1961.
- Huffman, Herbert. "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVIII (1959), 285-95.
- _____. "Exodus, Sinai and Credo," Catholic Biblical Quarterly (April, 1965), pp. 101-13.
- Hvidberg, Fleming Friis. Weeping and Laughter in the Old Testament. Leiden-Holland: E. J. Brill, 1962.
- Hylander, Ivar. Der Literarische Samuel - Saul - Komplex (I Sam. 1-15) traditionsgeichtlich untersucht. Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1932.
- Irwin, W. A. "Samuel and the Rise of the Monarchy," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, LVIII (1941), 113-34.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, II (1943), 159-72.
- Jastrow, M. "The Name of Samuel and the Stem SAL," Journal of Biblical Literature, XIX (1900), 83-105.
- Jenks, Alan W. The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, 1965.

- Jenni, Ernst. "Zwei Jahrzehnte Forschung an den Büchern Josua bis Könige, Theologische Rundschau, XXVII (1961), 1-32, 97-146.
- Kautzsch, E. and Cowley, A. E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- Keller, C. A. "Über einige Alttestamentliche Heiligtumslegenden," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXIII (1956), 85-97.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts. Being A History of the Text and its Translations. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1903.
- Kittel, Rudolf. Geschichte des Volkes Israel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1925. Vol. II.
- _____. A History of the Hebrews. Tr. John Taylor. London: Williams and Morgate, 1895. Vol. I.
- Kjaer, Hans. The Excavation of Shilo. Jerusalem: Beyl-Ul-Makdes Press, 1930.
- Klostermann, D. August. Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige (Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments, III). Nördlingen: C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1897.
- _____. Der Pentateuch. Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte. Second Edition. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1907.
- Knudtzon, J. A. Die El-Amarna Tafeln. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1913. Vol. I.
- Korosec, V. Hethitische Staatsverträge. Leipzig: Weicher, 1931.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. "Gilgal. Ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels," Vetus Testamentum, I (1951), 181-99.
- _____. Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel (Theologische Studien, LI). Eds. Karl Barth and Max Geiger. Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1957.
- _____. Worship in Israel. Tr. Geoffrey Buswell. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.
- Lagarde, P. de. Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars I graece edita. Göttingen: Arnold Hoyer, 1883.

- Lindblom, Johannes. "The Political Background of the Shiloh Oracle," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953. I, 78-87.
- Lods, Adolphe. Israel, from its Beginnings to the Middle of the Eighth Century. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932.
- _____. "Les Sources des Recits du Premier Livre de Samuel sur l'Institution de la Royaute Israelite," Etudes de Theologie et d'Histoire. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1901.
- _____. "Une Tablette Inedite de Mari," Studies in Old Testament Prophecy. Ed. H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1950. Pages 103-10.
- McCarthy, Dennis. Treaty and Covenant. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.
- McKane, W. "A Note on Esther IX and I Samuel XV," Journal of Theological Studies, XII (October, 1961), 260-61.
- MacKenzie, John L. "The Four Samuels," Biblical Research, VII (1962), 3-18.
- Mandelkern, Solomon. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae. Sixth Edition. Tel-Aviv, Israel: Schocken Hierosolymis, 1964.
- Mendelsohn, I. "On Corvee Labor in Ancient Canaan and Israel," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 167 (October, 1962), 31-35.
- _____. "Samuel's Denunciation of Kingship in the Light of the Akkadian Documents from Ugarit," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 143 (1956), 17-22.
- Mendenhall, George E. Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955.
- Möhlenbrink, Kurt. "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXVIII (1938), 238-68.
- Muilenburg, James. "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations," Vetus Testamentum, IX (1959), 347-65.
- _____. "The Literary Sources Bearing on the Question of Identification," Excavations at Tell en-Nasbeh. Berkeley and New Haven: The Palestine Institute. I, 23-44.

- _____. "The 'Office' of the Prophet in Ancient Israel," The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Ed. J. Philip Hyatt. Nashville: The Abingdon Press, 1965. Pages 74-97.
- Newman, Murray. The People of the Covenant. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1962.
- _____. "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Eds. Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962. Pages 86-97.
- Nielsen, Eduard. Shechem. A Traditio-Historical Investigation. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1955.
- North, C. R. "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, L (1932), 15-38.
- Noth, Martin. "Das Amt des 'Richters Israels,'" Festschrift Alfred Bertholet. Eds. Walter Baumgartner, Otto Eissfeldt, Karl Elliger, Leonhard Rost. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950. Pages 404-17.
- _____. Exodus (The Old Testament Library). Tr. J. S. Bowden. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.
- _____. "For all who rely on works of the law are under a curse," The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies. Tr. D. R. Ap-Thomas. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966. Pages 118-31.
- _____. "God, King and Nation," The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966.
- _____. History of Israel. Tr. P. R. Ackroyd. Second Edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.
- _____. "Samuel und Silo," Vetus Testamentum, XIII (October, 1963), 390-400.
- _____. Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960.
- _____. Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957.
- _____. Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948.
- Oestreicher, Theodor. Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz. Gütersloh: T. Bertelsmann, 1923.

- Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.
- Press, Richard. "Der Prophet Samuel. Eine traditionsge-
schichtliche Untersuchung," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LVI (1938), 177-225.
- Procksch, Otto. Das Nordhebräische Sagenbuch. Die Elohimquelle. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.
- Rabast, Karlheinz. Das apodiktische Recht im Deuteronomium und im Heiligkeitgesetz. Berlin-Hermsdorf: Heimatdienstverlag, 1948.
- Rainey, A. F. "The Kingdom of Ugarit," The Biblical Archaeologist, XXVIII (1965), 112-17.
- Reventlow, Henning Graf. "Prophetenamt und Mittleramt," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LVIII (1961), 269-84.
- Richter, W. Die Bearbeitungen des 'Retterbuches' in der Deuteronomischen Epoche (Bonner Biblische Beiträge). Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1964.
- Robertson, Edward. Samuel and Saul. Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 1944.
- _____. "Temple and Torah," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXVI (1941-42), 183-205.
- Rost, Leonhard. Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926.
- Scharbert, Josef. Heilsmittler im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient. Freiburg: Herder, 1964.
- Seebass, Horst. "I Sam 15 als Schlüssel für das Verständnis der sogenannten königsfreundlichen Reihe I Sam 9:1-10:16, 11:1-15, 13:2-14:52," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXVIII (1966), 148-79.
- _____. "Traditionsgeschichte von I Sam 8, 10f und 12," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXVII (1965), 286-96.
- Segal, H. H. "The Composition of the Books of Samuel," Jewish Quarterly Review, LV (1965), 318-39.
- _____. Sifre Shemuel. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1956.

- _____. "Studies in the Books of Samuel," Jewish Quarterly Review, V (1914), 201-31 and IX (1918-19), 43-69.
- Smith, Henry P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel (International Critical Commentary). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. "Charisma in Institution im Königtum Sauls," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXV (1963), 54-55.
- Speiser, Ephraim A. Genesis (The Anchor Bible). Eds. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1966.
- _____. "Legend of Sargon," Ancient Near Eastern Texts. Ed. James B. Pritchard. Second Edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955, p. 119.
- _____. "Of Shoes and Shekels," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 77 (February, 1940), pp. 15-20.
- Sperber, Alexander (ed.). The Bible in Aramaic. Vol. II: The Former Prophets According to Targum Jonathan. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.
- Thenius, Otto. Die Bücher Samuelis (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Heft IV). Leipzig: Weidmann, 1864.
- Tsevat, Matitiahu. "Studies in the Book of Samuel," Hebrew Union College Annual (1961), pp. 191-217.
- Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. Tr. John McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Voegelin, Eric. Israel and Revelation (Order and History, I). New Orleans: Louisiana State University Press, 1956.
- Volz, D. Paul. Prophetengestalten des Alten Testaments. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1949.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. "The Deuteronomic Theology of History in I and II Kings," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Tr. E. W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966. Pages 205-21.
- _____. Deuteronomy (The Old Testament Library). Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.

- _____. "The Early History of the Form-Category of I Corinthians XIII. 4-7," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Tr. E. W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966. Pages 301-17.
- _____. "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Tr. E. W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966. Pages 1-78.
- _____. Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.
- _____. Old Testament Theology. Vol. I: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions. Tr. D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962.
- _____. Old Testament Theology. Vol. II: The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions. Tr. D. M. G. Stalker. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1965.
- _____. Studies in Deuteronomy. (Studies in Biblical Theology, 9). Tr. David Stalker. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1953.
- _____. "The Tent and the Ark," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Tr. E. W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966. Pages 103-24.
- Weiser, Artur. "I Samuel 15," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LIV (1936), 1-28.
- _____. The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development. Tr. Dorothea M. Barton. New York: The Association Press, 1961.
- _____. Samuel; seine geschichtliche Aufgabe und religiöse Bedeutung. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962.
- Welch, Adam C. Deuteronomy. The Framework to the Code. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Wellhausen, Julius. Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.
- _____. Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel. Tr. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company, 1957.
- _____. Der Text der Bücher Samuelis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1872.

Westermann, Claus. Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech. Tr. Hugh C. White. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.

Wildberger, H. "Samuel und die Entstehung des israelitischen Königtums," Theologische Zeitschrift, XIII (1957), 442-69.

Wright, G. Ernest. "Deuteronomy. Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible. Ed. George Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952. II, 311-30.

_____. "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Eds. Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962. Pages 26-67.